Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

presented by

AMERICAN
BAPTIST
PUBLICATION
SOCIETY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

~~232.9~~
FX10
~~St47t~~

110

B.T.S. renewal.

232
S.

140-149

ch3

New Testament Handbooks

EDITED BY

SHAILER MATHEWS

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

NEW TESTAMENT HANDBOOKS

EDITED BY SHAILER MATHEWS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A series of volumes presenting briefly and intelligibly the results of the scientific study of the New Testament. Each volume covers its own field, and is intended for the general reader as well as the special student.

THE HISTORY OF THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Professor MARVIN R. VINCENT, Union Theological Seminary. 12mo. Cloth.

THE HISTORY OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Professor HENRY S. NASH, Cambridge Divinity School. 12mo. Cloth.

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Professor B. WISNER BACON, Yale Divinity School. 12mo. Cloth.

THE HISTORY OF NEW TESTAMENT TIMES IN PALESTINE. Professor SHAILER MATHEWS, The University of Chicago. Revised edition. 12mo. Cloth.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS. Professor GEORGE B. STEVENS, Yale Divinity School. 12mo. Cloth.

THE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Professor E. P. GOULD. 12mo. Cloth.

THE ETHICS OF JESUS. President HENRY CHURCHILL KING, Oberlin College. 12mo. Cloth.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

BY

GEORGE BARKER STEVENS, PH.D., D.D.

DWIGHT PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY
IN YALE UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.
1923

All rights reserved

Copyright, 1901,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped September, 1901.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith
Norwood Mass. U.S.A.

232.954
S844

TO

The Reverend

CHARLES MELLEN TYLER, M.A., D.D.

PROFESSOR IN CORNELL UNIVERSITY

I Dedicate This Volume

IN SINCERE GRATITUDE AND AFFECTION

10157

PREFACE

Modern theology concentrates its attention more and more upon Jesus, — his life, character, and teaching. The numerous *Lives of Christ* and the many treatises upon different aspects of his doctrine, which have appeared within recent years, attest the eager interest which the Christian world feels in his person and history. The diminished emphasis which, by many schools of thought, is now placed upon other objects of religious and theological import — such as the letter of Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition — has served to increase the stress which is laid upon the supreme significance of Christ for the Christian knowledge of God. The dimming of other lights has but enhanced the brightness of his glory.

The aim of this volume is to aid in clarifying the meaning of Christ's life and work by setting forth the principles of his teaching in a clear, succinct, and systematic form. The effort has been made to translate the thought of Jesus into modern terms, and so to correlate the different elements of his teaching as to exhibit its inner unity. His sayings have also been brought into frequent comparison with the Jewish

P. J. LIBRARY
K. C. K.
BAPTIST SEMINARY

religious ideas of his age, in order to exhibit the historical background on which his teaching was presented, and thus to bring out into clearer relief its striking independence and originality.

The volume is designed as a text-book for schools and Bible classes and as a manual for private study. It is hoped that it will also prove useful to students of theology and ministers in their preparation for the work of teaching.

GEORGE BARKER STEVENS.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
July 13, 1901.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

JEWISH RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN THE TIME OF JESUS . 1

The historical background of New Testament teaching — The legal and the prophetic tendencies in Judaism — The Jewish doctrine of God and that of Jesus contrasted — Jewish doctrine of the Kingdom of God and of the Messianic King — Reflections of these views in the New Testament — Jesus' doctrine in contrast with them — Jewish doctrine of salvation — Its fundamental difference from that of Jesus.

CHAPTER II

THE RECORDS OF JESUS' WORDS AND DEEDS . . . 19

The oral Gospel — Beginnings of evangelical literature — Patristic testimony concerning the Synoptics — The Logia — Two-source theory of the Synoptics — Characteristics of the three Synoptics — Historical value of these records — The fourth Gospel — Peculiarities of its type of teaching.

CHAPTER III

THE METHODS OF JESUS' TEACHING 32

Jesus' teaching contrasted with that of the scribes — His dialectic — Outward forms of his teaching — The parable — Its difference from the fable, the myth, the proverb, and the allegory — The interpretation of parables.

CHAPTER IV

PAGE

JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD THE OLD TESTAMENT . . 47

Jesus' teaching has its roots in the Old Testament — Yet is freely developed — Solution of this seeming contradiction by the principle of fulfilment — Jesus' attitude toward the sacrificial system, the ceremonial law, the Sabbath — Examples of his fulfilment of the law — Scope of the principle.

CHAPTER V

THE KINGDOM OF GOD 58

The idea of the kingdom of God in the Old Testament and in the later Judaism — Jesus' conception: the kingdom universal, spiritual, and both present and future — Definitions — The place of the kingdom in the teaching of Jesus.

CHAPTER VI

THE FATHER IN HEAVEN 70

Central place of God's fatherhood in the teaching of Jesus — God the Father of all men — The import of man's sonship to God — How Jesus fulfils the Old Testament idea of God — "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

CHAPTER VII

THE SON OF MAN 81

Use of the term in the Old Testament — Development of its Messianic meaning — Its use in the Synoptics — Theories respecting its import — Sketch of the "Aramaic theory" — Reasons for regarding it as a Messianic designation.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SON OF GOD 95

The use of the term in the Old Testament — In later Jewish literature — In the Synoptics — In the

PAGE

fourth Gospel — Designates the special object of the Father's love and favor — New Testament use of the title distinguished from the later theological meaning — The beginnings of speculative Christology.

CHAPTER IX

THE VALUE AND DESTINY OF MAN 106

Jesus' estimate of the worth of man — His doctrine of sin — Reasons for his divergence from the popular views — The *pericope adulterae* — Jesus did not pronounce sweeping judgments on human nature — Did not teach "total depravity" — The sin against the Holy Spirit — The basis of the belief in immortality.

CHAPTER X

THE NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL WORLDS 117

The problem of Jesus' knowledge — Jesus' view and interpretation of nature — His attitude toward social joys — The family and divorce — Private property — Not an ascetic — Civil authority — Not a teacher of science or criticism — "Demoniacal possession" — Spoke the language of his age.

CHAPTER XI

THE RELIGION OF A GOOD LIFE 130

Jesus' doctrine of righteousness — Meaning and requirements of love — Forgiveness — The passive virtues — Self-respect — Charity — Worship — Deeds and services — The grace and generosity of God — Conditions on which love bestows its blessings.

CHAPTER XII

THE MEANS OF SALVATION 140

The conditions of salvation — Jesus saves (1) by teaching, (2) by personal example and influence, (3) by his death — Necessity for his death — His blood

PAGE

shed for many — Theories concerning the saving significance of Jesus' death — Statements of the fourth Gospel — Relation of his death to his life-work in general — Its relation to the ethical nature of God and to human sin.

CHAPTER XIII

THE BELIEVING COMMUNITY 150

Earlier and later meanings of "church" — The two passages in Matthew in which the word occurs — Discipline in the congregation — Binding and loosing — The power of the keys — The "primacy" of Peter — The Church and the Kingdom — Why a Christian society was necessary — The Christian and the Jewish Church — The "great commission" — The career of the Church in history.

CHAPTER XIV

THE SECOND COMING 161

In connection with the tour of the twelve — Within the lifetime of the hearers — In close connection with the fall of Jerusalem — Shall be witnessed by the high priest — Referred to in the parables — Summary of the facts — Proposed explanations of the difficulties which they present — The alternative — Conclusion reached — Its relation to the current theories — Christ's coming in John.

CHAPTER XV

THE RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT 177

Resurrection in the Synoptic teaching — Its relation to Jewish thought — The subject as presented in the fourth Gospel — Jesus' view ethical — The "day" of judgment — The parable of judgment — Various interpretations — Johannine doctrine of judgment — The principle of judgment.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

CHAPTER I

JEWISH RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IN THE TIME OF JESUS [1]

Importance of the subject.

It is now generally recognized among students of the New Testament that it is necessary for the right understanding of it to study the Jewish religious ideas which were current at the time when its books were written. These ideas constitute a background on which the teaching of the New Testament stands forth in clear relief. Accordingly we find that most recent writers who treat of the teaching of Jesus take full account of the religious beliefs which were common in his time. I propose, in this introductory chapter, to set forth some of the leading religious ideas which were current in the time of Jesus, with a view to illustrating the principal likenesses and differences between his teaching and the religious opinions of his age.

Allusions in the Gospels to the thought-world of Jesus.

The New Testament abounds with references to the thought-world of Jesus. His own discourses and parables make frequent allusions to the tenets of the

[1] General References: Schürer, *The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ;* Hausrath and Mathews on *New Testament Times;* Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, Vol. I, Section i; Toy, *Judaism and Christianity;* Schürer, *Die Predigt Jesu Christi in ihrem Verhältniss zum alten Testament und zum Judenthum;* Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judenthum;* Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, ch. i; Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, ch. i; Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, Theil I; Weber, *Jüdische Theologie;* Goodspeed, *Israel's Messianic Hope.*

Pharisees and Sadducees. Many of the conversations which he held with his disciples, and many of the controversies which he carried on with his critics, turn upon points of current religious opinion. Objections were often made to his teaching, by the religious leaders of the period, on the ground that it was contrary to the received views and current practices of the prevailing religion. He was charged with violation of the sabbath, with failure to comply with the requirements of the law respecting lustrations and other ritual observances. By his enemies he was thought lax in the observance of the ceremonial, and even of the moral, requirements of the Old Testament. "Why do thy disciples fast not?" was asked. "Where ought men to worship?" "Which is the great commandment of the law?" "What does the Mosaic law require in this or that application of it?" "What attitude should one take up toward the Roman empire?"

The legal tendency of Judaism.

Two general tendencies are noticeable in Jewish thought, which we may roughly designate as the legal and the prophetic. The legal tendency is illustrated in the emphasis which was laid upon ritualistic and ceremonial observances, in the rigor with which the requirements of the Mosaic law were enforced, and in the importance which was attached to obedience to them in order to salvation. The legalistic spirit gave rise to the development of an oral law, full of specific exactions and minute refinements. Of these regulations the scribes were the recognized expounders. In their zeal for complete obedience to the law they had so elaborated, by argument and inference, its supposed requirements that the burden of compliance was, indeed, "grievous to be borne."[1]

[1] On Scribism, see Mathews, *History of N. T. Times*, 161, 162; Schürer, *Jewish People*, etc., Div. II, IV, 306–351; *Jewish Quarterly Review*, January, 1901, 161–217.

The prophetic tendency finds its classic illustration in the moral and political teaching of the canonical prophets whose sermons have been preserved in the Old Testament. With them the principal emphasis was laid upon the moral and spiritual aspects of life. Righteousness, purity, conformity in thought and purpose with the will of God, were the burden of their message. In the later Jewish period the legal tendency quite predominated over the prophetic. Religion had become a formal affair, a matter of outward observance and ritual. This is the aspect of the Jewish religion which meets us most prominently in the New Testament. It had profoundly affected both the theoretical and practical view which the Jewish people took of God and of the relations of mankind to him.

The prophetic tendency.

Approaching now more closely to our more immediate subject, we find that Jewish thought regarded God as sustaining a special relation to Israel. God was indeed a father, but he was preëminently, if not exclusively, the father of Israel. His relation to the rest of mankind was, to say the least, vague and undefined. It cannot be denied that this conception of God's relation to Israel had a certain great truth and value. It tended to bind the people together into a close and compact unity. They regarded themselves as a people of God in an altogether exceptional and peculiar sense. This conviction gave them an intense realization of the presence of God in their life and history, and of his providential purpose in their development. But it had its dangers. It tended also to a certain narrowness in the conception which was cherished of God's nature and character. It tended to the localization of God's presence and to the limitation of his favor. Narrow and selfish views, conceptions of God as partial to the Jewish people, as

God as Israel's father only.

limiting to them his grace and revelation, easily developed themselves out of this idea. We find that this danger was extensively realized, and hence in the New Testament we are assured that there is no respect of persons with God, — a statement which is intended to contradict a current opinion concerning him.

Separation of God from the world.

Another element in the popular Jewish idea of God is what we may call the belief in his transcendence, his remoteness from the world. This was a result of the Jewish conception of God's holiness. By holiness was meant separateness from all that is evil. But this idea was so carried out practically as to separate God from the world and from human life altogether. Hence we find, in the late Jewish literature, that the gap between God and the world was conceived of as bridged over by a series of intermediate beings. Angels, especially, were regarded as intermediaries between God and his world. It was common to represent the law as given by angels, and all acts of God are described as done by his representatives rather than by himself. Sometimes some attribute or activity of God was personified, and was represented as performing divine functions. Hence we read of the wisdom or of the word of God as his agent in creation and providence.

Religious consequences of these conceptions.

This conception of transcendence, so generally held by the Jews, lent itself to the support of the judicial and legal aspect of religion. God had prescribed in detail all that men were to do, and had left them to carry out his commandments. He dwelt afar off in light unapproachable; his worshipper did not enter into vital communion with him, but performed his round of tasks and ceremonies, — the "good works" of the law, — and when he had done this, was regarded as having done all that was required. It is easy to

see how these ideas tended to the practical exclusion of the doctrine of God's grace, and of his living presence among men. All was formal, legal, prescribed. Every act of obedience had its definite value, and would receive its appropriate reward. Under the influence of these conceptions the Jewish religion, in the scribal period, lost much of that vitality and intensity of moral conviction and spiritual power which it had possessed in earlier times. It became a tithing of mint, anise, and cummin, to the neglect of the great matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and love.[1]

Contrast between Jesus' teaching and Judaism.

No contrast could be greater than that between this legal and external type of religion and the teaching and life of Jesus. For him religion consisted not so much in a prescribed round of religious duty, as in a certain disposition, a certain way of feeling, thinking, and choosing. Religion was for him an affair of the heart, of the inner life. The conditions of acceptance with God which he prescribed were wholly moral and spiritual. One may worship God with equal acceptance in any place. His service consists not so much in the outer forms of action as in the inward temper and character, in love to God and to man.

Jesus' fulfilment of the Old Testament religion.

We may thus see how Jesus fulfilled the idea of God in the Jewish religion, as he fulfilled all its ideas which had elements of truth in them; how he penetrated to the heart of the religion of his time, rejecting its mere husk, and preserving its essential kernel of truth. He did not repudiate the laws, customs, and beliefs of his age, but he developed into fulness the kernel of truth in them, and insisted upon their inner meaning. He did not really desecrate the sabbath, but he dared to show men what the true meaning

[1] Yet see the earnest defence of Rabbinical theology by Montefiore. "Rabbinical Judaism and the Epistles of Paul," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, January, 1901, 161–217.

and use of the sabbath were. He did not forbid ceremonial washings, the making of distinctions in meats, and the like, but he insisted upon the greater value and importance of moral purity. He took part in the sacrificial worship of his time, but constantly urged that what God primarily required of men was mercy rather than sacrifice. He summarized his teaching in the great principle of love, which he said was the sum of all commandments, the essence and basis of all true religious obligation and duty.

Old and new in the teaching of Jesus.

Thus there was in our Lord's teaching, as related to the current beliefs of his age, something old and something new. All his principles were rooted in the Old Testament. He found there the germ of all that he had to teach; but he found the essential divine truth there contained so overlaid with tradition, and with extravagant application and false interpretation, that he was compelled to reject much that had been added to the principles of his ancestral religion. These principles he then brought out into clear expression, and enforced them with new and higher motives, and taught them in forms which could be apprehended by the people.

The characteristic note of Israel's piety.

Let us next review the current Jewish ideas of Jesus' age concerning the kingdom of God.

The people of Israel have been described as an incarnate hope. The most characteristic peculiarity of their life and thought was the fact that they looked forward with longing and confidence to a golden age in the future. A good and glorious time was coming. This hope was expressed in a great variety of forms, but all of these illustrate the ideality which was characteristic of Jewish thought. Sometimes this ideal was lofty and spiritual, as in the case of the great prophets; sometimes narrow and worldly, as in the case of the scribes and Pharisees of Jesus' age. But

a great interest always attaches to such a hopeful view of the future as was cherished by the Jews. It illustrates their dissatisfaction with present conditions, and the persistency with which they hoped for an intervention of God in their history, and for a realization of blessedness in the coming age.

The coming heavenly kingdom.

One form in which this ideal was expressed was that of a great and glorious kingdom of blessedness in which the people should be holy and happy under the dominion and favor of God. This ideal sprang from an intense sense of God's authority and right to reign. It was founded on the theocratic idea, and on the conception that human society should be organized under the divine law and in accord with the divine will. It was a great and elevating conception. It represented society as ennobled and purified, as a state in which the will of God is done on earth as in heaven. According to this ideal, a pure worship and service was to be offered to God continually. His people were to be all righteous; everything was to be consecrated to his service, and even on the utensils of daily life and labor was to be inscribed "Holiness unto the Lord."[1]

Political form of this idea.

The manner in which this ideal was cherished was determined largely by the existing religious and political conditions of the nation. When Israel became prosperous, under the reign of her great kings, David and Solomon, it was natural that her ideal for the future should be colored by the life and experience of that period. Moreover, in Israel Church and State were one. It was practically impossible to conceive of a religious ideal apart from political prosperity and happiness. Hence we find that the future golden age is often portrayed under forms of thought which were

[1] On the source and nature of the Messianic expectation in Judaism, see Mathews, *op. cit.*, 163–168; Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*; and especially Schürer and Weber, *op. cit.*

S. LIBRARY
P. K. C. K.
BAPTIST SEMINARY

derived from the history of the Davidic monarchy. The literature of late Judaism discloses considerable variety in the forms of the Messianic hope. The ethical and religious characteristics of the kingdom were strongly emphasized by some, while by others they were remanded to the background. The political element, however, was always fundamental, even when, as is commonly the case in the extant literature, Messianism was eschatological and apocalyptic.[1]

Its moral and religious aspect.

But while the kingdom was thus conceived of as earthly in its location and character, the idea of its heavenly origin was by no means wholly lost. It was the kingdom of heaven still for the Jewish mind, although the means by which it should be realized were quite earthly. It was a tendency in Israel to conceive of the favor of God as limited to the chosen people, which narrowed and belittled the great Old Testament conception of the coming kingdom. The prophetic descriptions of the prosperity and glory of the nation in the Messianic age were interpreted with a crude literalism which robbed them of their loftier and more spiritual suggestions. It was the Jewish particularism, the conviction that Israel was the special favorite of heaven, which exercised so unfortunate an influence upon the Jewish conception of the kingdom of God. It was because the Jews had little idea of God's universal fatherhood and boundless love to all mankind that they pictured his kingdom as a renewed and triumphant Israel.

The effect of Israel's experiences upon the idea of the kingdom.

Another circumstance which tended powerfully to this same result was the great oppression to which the nation was subjected in the later period of its history. Overwhelmed in a series of conquests by the Oriental and Occidental monarchies of the time, the

[1] The best instance of non-apocalyptic Messianism is undoubtedly Ps. of Solomon, 17.

Jewish people turned with ardent longing and hope to the promise of the blessed coming age. It was natural that, in these circumstances, the hope of this kingdom should take on a more earthly character than ever before. Deliverance from the conqueror and persecutor was the ardent desire of every Jewish heart. The nation cried out in bitter anguish under the heavy yoke of the oppressor which weighed down upon it. It was during this period that apocalyptic literature took its rise, — that species of prophecy which was produced by the combination of suffering and of hope under the Greek and Roman dominations. In this later period of Jewish history, which continued down into the New Testament time, the dominant note of Israel's hope for the future was the desire to throw off the Roman yoke, and to see the nation recover once more its freedom, prosperity, and power. This result was to be realized by Israel becoming the governing power over other nations, though the accomplishment of this through a king in Israel was not always insisted on. It is not strange that, under these conditions, the minds of the people should have been haunted by dreams of national glory, and that the flame of hatred against the ruling worldly powers should have burst forth with unexampled fury.

The kingdom visible and earthly

Throughout the New Testament we find traces of the ideas of the kingdom to which we have been referring. "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" men said; that is, establish the nation in strength and prosperity by overthrowing the power of its enemies. Even Christ's own disciples entertained this conception of his kingdom. Two of them would sit, one on his right hand and the other on his left, in his kingdom. It was believed by those who followed him that his kingdom would come with observation, —

that is, with some sudden and powerful forth-putting of divine energy.[1]

Corresponding idea of the Messiah.

The popular Jewish doctrine of the Messiah corresponded with the current conception of the kingdom of God. The Messiah was to usher in this reign of prosperity and peace. In proportion as the kingdom of God was conceived of in a worldly and political way, in that proportion did the doctrine of the Messiah take on a similar character. If the kingdom was to be a worldly empire, the Messiah must be a worldly ruler or prince. Hence we find that in the later Jewish period the person and work of the Messiah were chiefly regarded in this light. It was believed that he would lead a popular uprising against the dominant Roman power, throw off the hated yoke of political oppression, and reconstitute the nation in prosperity and peace. Under his sway their sorrows and sufferings should cease, a blessed reign of happiness should be realized, and the bright hopes of Israel concerning the future golden age find their perfect fulfilment. The Messianism of later Judaism was strongly eschatological and supernatural in tone. The "coming age" was to be a new and distinct epoch, intermediate between the present evil age and the final consummation. As the vision of Israel's glory and triumph in the present world-period grew dim and uncertain, religious thought turned to a new æon which God should introduce by direct supernatural power when Messiah should reign king of nations.

Why Messiah could not suffer and die.

We accordingly find that in the time of Jesus the dominant conception of the Messiah was that he should be a ruler and king. Visions of power and glory filled the minds of the people of that time. They were no longer able to discern the import of the higher prophetic descriptions of Messiah's mission. The

[1] For a comparison of Jesus' idea of the kingdom with that of the popular expectation, see Ch. IV.

representations of the suffering servant of Jehovah in Isaiah were either ignored or ingeniously explained away. The Jews of Jesus' time did not believe in a suffering and dying Messiah. It was contrary to their whole conception of Messiah's person and function that he should suffer defeat, and ultimately an ignominious death. How could he thus suffer, when he was ordained of God to be the victorious champion of his people? How could he fulfil the promise of deliverance if he submitted himself to death?

Effect of Israel's sufferings on the Messianic idea.

The conviction that the Messiah would triumph and reign, that he would defeat Israel's enemies and lead the nation forth to a glorious victory, was greatly intensified during the years immediately preceding the appearance of Christ. The oppressions and sufferings which the nation experienced under the Roman domination, which tended so powerfully to the secularization of the doctrine of the kingdom, tended with equal power to a worldly and political conception of the Messiah. So completely were the thoughts of the Jewish people taken up with their hardships and sorrows, that they could think of little else than deliverance from the hated power of the Romans. It was not strange that their inherited view, that a good and happy time was coming, should take the form of a belief that the promised Messiah would usher in this glorious era. It was quite natural that the future blessedness should include as its most prominent element that deliverance from oppression of which they were so constantly compelled to think. When all the circumstances of the time are considered, it becomes quite feasible to explain the way in which the Messianic idea in Judaism had degenerated from the lofty spiritual conception of the old prophets to the political view of his person and work current in the time of Jesus.

We find ample illustration in the New Testament

The popular views reflected in the New Testament.

of this popular Messianic idea of which we have been speaking. The primary significance of Christ's temptation was that he was called upon to decide whether he would follow the popular conception of Messiah's work, or, deserting this, choose out another and a higher course of action. One element in the popular demand for the Messiah's work was that he should do great and startling miracles, that he should defeat his enemies by overwhelming exhibitions of divine power and authority. His temptation in the wilderness is a pictorial representation of this idea. Let Messiah, if he be truly such, cast himself down from the pinnacle of the temple; let him turn the stones of the desert into bread; let him compel the acceptance of his authority and mission by such impressive exhibitions of divine miraculous power that none could refuse to confess him to be the chosen leader of God's people. It may be that John the Baptist cherished a view of Messiah's work that was somewhat tinged with this conception. The Messiah was to come with a winnowing fan of divine judgment to separate the wheat from the chaff. He was to come with a signal display of his supreme majesty and power. Certain it is that many of Jesus' disciples shared to a great extent in this theory of Messiah's work. They hoped for positions of authority and power in his world-empire. They dreamed of a restoration of the kingdom to Israel. The course which Jesus actually pursued in propagating his truth and in founding his kingdom involved a profound disappointment to many of his followers.

Shared in part by the first disciples.

Contrast of popular view and that of Jesus.

How bewildered they were as he continued to do his work without fulfilling any of those conditions which they regarded as essential to the setting up of his kingdom! He founded no party; he led no popular uprising; he authorized no use of the sword; he refrained from all participation in political affairs. They could

not understand that his kingdom was in the realm of the spirit, and that his object was to make himself king in the sphere of men's inner life. Between the popular idea of Messiah's mission and that which Jesus taught and realized there was a great gulf, which the minds of his disciples were not able to bridge. It was only gradually, under the guidance and illumination of the Spirit, that they were able to enter into the meaning of his spiritual view of his kingdom and work.

Element of truth in the worldly view of Messiah's work.

But, defective as was the popular Jewish view of Messiah's mission, far as it fell short of the higher prophetic ideal on the subject, there was still a kernel of truth preserved within it. That truth was that the gospel of Christ is a gospel for this world and for the present life of man. Its spirituality does not mean that it has no application to the duties, relationships, and experiences of this present life. It is a gospel of social well-being. It is a gospel even of political prosperity and progress, but it is this because it is, first of all, the gospel of a Godlike life. It is the gospel of man's outer life because it is primarily the gospel of his inner life. Yet these two aspects of the teaching of Jesus were not apprehended in this relation by many to whom he spoke; it was difficult for them to place the spiritual first, and to see that the outward and temporary was of secondary interest and concern. It was one of the constant efforts of Jesus to enable men to see the meaning and application of his work in its true proportions, to enable men to place that first which *is* first, and thus to seek the realization of their social and political well-being through their sympathy and harmony with the holy will and purpose of God.

Jesus' conception of his own glory and power.

Nor would it be correct to say that Jesus himself did not have his doctrine of Messiah's victory and majesty. He used language as strong as that of any of the prophets concerning the world-dominion which

awaited him. He did not hesitate to say that the Father had committed all things, all authority, all power in heaven and in earth, to him. But he was to come to this victory, not by methods of worldly ambition, but by the diviner way of humility, sacrifice, and service. There is nothing more characteristic in the consciousness and work of Jesus than the way in which he combined the apparently opposite conceptions of humiliation and abasement and those of exaltation and majesty. We shall see that his favorite self-designation, "the Son of man," was probably adopted by him because it lent itself to the expression of this combination of ideas. In some of its uses "son of man" in the Old Testament was a designation of weakness and humility; in others, a designation of strength and majesty. Now Jesus took up into himself both of these characters, and united them in a perfect combination. He humbled himself and was thereby exalted. The way to his throne was the way of the cross. He gave himself up to the life of perfect sacrifice and service that he might thereby be glorified through self-denying love. He was lifted up on the shameful cross, but in thus being lifted up, was able to draw all men unto himself.

Jesus fulfils the Old Testament Messianic ideals.

Thus we see how Jesus fulfils the Old Testament and the popular Jewish Messianic idea. He conserves in his teaching and work the essential spiritual truths contained in that idea, but he strips it of all that is gross and earthly. He elevates and dignifies the hope of Israel by showing that a far higher purpose of God is to be realized in his work than that of which the Jewish people had ever dreamed.

The doctrine of salvation.

The popular Jewish conception of salvation agrees with the idea of God and his kingdom which I have outlined. Two points are to be especially noted.

One is the view taken of atonement; the other, the doctrine of righteousness. The notion of reparation underlies the doctrine of atonement. Sin is conceived as a debt, or as failure to render what is due to God. Something must therefore be rendered to him in place of the obedience which is his due. Various acts and experiences might serve this purpose. Repentance, suffering, almsgiving, and especially death, were thought to have atoning significance. These acts procured the favor of God for the sinner. They balanced his account, as it were, in the estimation of the righteous Judge. One of the commonest atonements for sin was the vicarious suffering of the righteous on behalf of the guilty. The great saints of Israel's history, the patriarchs and prophets, were regarded as having suffered hardships and persecutions for the benefit of those who came after. They had accumulated for their descendants, by their vicarious experiences, a treasury of merits which could be drawn upon by the guilty people of Israel in time of need. In like manner parents might expiate the sins of their children. Thus it was the duty of every man to do what he could to cancel the guilt of others, as others had done a like service for him.

Atoning value of good works

Among the good works which were thought to have an atoning value almsgiving held an especially high place. In the Jewish view this was a form of self-denial which was particularly pleasing to God. We meet traces of this idea in the New Testament in the passages which lay special stress upon the selling of one's goods, and giving to the poor. It may be due to the influence of this idea that the word "alms" supplanted the word "righteousness" in the passage: "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them."[1]

[1] Matt. 6 : 1.

One practical effect of the theory.

The point of chief importance, in connection with these satisfactions for sin, is that they could not beget in the pious soul the certainty of acceptance with God. One could not be sure that he had performed absolutely every duty, that the trials and hardships which he had experienced were sufficient. The result was that the secure sense of God's favor and forgiveness was wanting among the more thoughtful and serious Jews of the period under review. So long as it depended upon what man could do and experience whether he was saved or not, no certitude respecting salvation was attainable. That which was lacking in this view of salvation was the element of divine grace, the conviction of the undeserved favor and unfailing love of God of whose benefits one may be absolutely sure whenever he is willing to accept them.

The idea of righteousness.

The prevailing conception of righteousness, that is, of acceptance with God, which went along with this doctrine of salvation was that of a formal legal acquittal. Righteousness consisted in the doing of the commandments, and these were thought to lay main stress upon expiations and ritual requirements. Hence the externalism to which the New Testament so frequently refers. Men easily thought themselves righteous when their conceptions of righteousness were low and inadequate.

Another attitude and its result.

It should not be supposed, however, from what has been said, that all the Jews of Jesus' time took only superficial views of God's requirements, and indulged a complaisant self-satisfaction in the belief that they had fulfilled them. Some were led, by their efforts to satisfy the divine demands as they conceived them, not to self-righteousness, but to despair.

Paul's testimony.

We find a striking example of this result in the pre-Christian experience of the Apostle Paul. In the seventh chapter of Romans he depicts a conflict

between the power of sin and the higher impulse of the reason or the conscience. This conflict he describes in the first person, showing that it is a reflection of his own experience before he found pardon and peace through Christ. He says that when the law became known to him in its high moral requirements, it disclosed him to himself in the real depths of his sinfulness and in his utter powerlessness to do what the law required. Earlier in life he had dwelt in fancied security, supposing himself, no doubt, as others did, to have kept God's commandments, and to be secure in his favor. But when he gained a deeper insight into the real height and depth of the law's demands, he saw how impossible it was for him, in his own unaided strength, to fulfil them. The result was entire uncertainty of acceptance with God, a brooding despair of his favor. This experience was the preparation, even if negative and indirect, for his reception of the gospel of the grace of God in Christ. Thus we observe how the most opposite consequences might flow from the popular views of righteousness and salvation, according to the temper of the person entertaining them. The religious consciousness of Judaism may thus be said to have oscillated between self-righteousness and despair. Those who fancied that they had done all were self-confident; those who were in doubt were the prey of despair.

Salvation by merit.

Practically the popular Jewish doctrine was that of salvation by merit. Every good deed was regarded as entitled to its appropriate reward. The sum of a man's good deeds, or of his meritorious experiences, constituted his claim upon the favor of heaven. "What good thing shall I do to inherit eternal life?" expresses the dominant note of this piety. To this popular view the Epistles of Paul frequently refer. He well knew, both from observation and from

experience, its practical influence and effect. He had once sought peace in accordance with its principles, but in vain.

Contrast between Judaism and Christianity.

No contrast could be greater than that between Jesus' teaching concerning religion and this Pharisaic theory. He taught that trust is what God requires, that the humble and teachable disposition is what is most pleasing to him. Men do not climb up into God's favor by works of righteousness or ceremonial performances which they do, but they receive his salvation as a gift of pure grace. The watchwords of the late Jewish theology were works and debt; those of Christianity were grace and faith.

CHAPTER II

THE RECORDS OF JESUS' WORDS AND DEEDS[1]

The oral method of Jesus' teaching.

UNLIKE most great teachers, Jesus did not commit his teaching to writing. It was evidently no part of his purpose to give his instruction a stereotyped form. His profoundest and most striking sayings were often uttered upon a chance meeting with some stranger; his inimitable parables were spoken to little groups at the wayside or by the lake shore; while his greatest works were often accompanied by an injunction of silence upon those who had witnessed them.[2] Did any other public teacher ever adopt so strange a course? Was there ever such carelessness of results, such apparent waste of effort? If his purpose had been to give formal rules for the conduct of life or to propound doctrines and explanations on the perplexing problems of human speculation and research, his method must be pronounced a very faulty and in-

[1] General References: Articles, "Gospels," in Smith's *Bible Dictionary* (new edition), by Sanday, and in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, by Stanton (containing full bibliographies), and by Abbott and Schmiedel in Cheyne-Black, *Ency. Bib.*; the relevant sections of the *Introductions to the New Testament*, by Weiss, Salmon, Bacon, Holtzmann, and Jülicher (the last two untranslated); Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu* (untranslated); Cone, *Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity*; Wright, *The Composition of the Four Gospels*; Woods, "The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels" (in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, Vol. II); Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage*.

[2] Matt. 9:30; 12:16; Mk. 5:43; 7:36; Lk. 5:14; 8:56.

adequate one. How could sayings be accurately preserved, how could doctrines be kept free from error, which were thus thrown out in casual conversations, with no apparent care for their precise form and no provision for their accurate preservation?

Why did not Jesus commit his teaching to writing?

How evident it is that the purpose of Jesus must have been something quite different from a formal delivery of doctrines or rules. It was the inspiration and quickening of the lives of men at which he was aiming. He was bent upon lodging living truths in the heart of humanity, and he knew that he could best do this, not by the methods of the scribe and the school, but by that personal, first-hand contact with men, by that vital touch of mind and heart, through which alone one personality can communicate its treasures to another. Hence Jesus chose the vital, personal method of teaching. He sent forth his message tipped and winged with the fire of living conviction and enthusiasm, with no fear that it would fail of either power or preservation. His confidence in the truth he spoke was absolute. He knew that it would live and thrive and bear fruit in the life of the world. It needed no outward support, no factitious recommendations, no authoritative enforcement, no parade of logic or learning. It was the truth of God — the truth of reason — the truth of man's nature. Jesus dared to sow it broadcast upon the soil of human life, trusting in its inherent power for its preservation, and in its divine adaptation to the nature of man for its success.

No need of written Gospels during the first years of the Church.

We do not know how long a time passed before the disciples of Jesus began to write down accounts of his words and deeds — probably two or three decades, at least. The Apostle Paul, whose principal epistles fall within the period from twenty to thirty-five years after the death of Christ, occasionally quotes words of

the Lord, but he does not speak as if they were taken from authoritative or generally recognized books. He seems, rather, to be drawing upon a fund of current apostolic tradition. During the early years of the apostolic age the disciples would have no occasion to write narratives of the Lord's teaching and work. The Master himself was photographed upon every mind and heart; his words and deeds lived in the memory of his followers, and the knowledge of them was preserved and perpetuated by frequent repetition in Christian teaching. But as the first generation of believers began to die out, and as Christianity spread beyond its original home in Palestine, the need of written memoranda would begin to make itself felt. Probably within twenty or twenty-five years after Jesus' departure from earth, men began to make fragmentary records of his words and deeds, partly as means of preserving the memory of them, and partly as means of instructing new converts who did not have access to the testimonies of the eye and ear witnesses.

The beginnings of evangelical literature.

The Evangelist Luke has given us in his Preface[1] a most instructive account of the origin and motive of his own Gospel and, incidentally, of the still earlier narratives of the Lord's life. From this passage we learn: (1) that many records of Jesus' words and deeds had been made before Luke composed his own; (2) that these narratives were based upon the testimony of the eye and ear witnesses; (3) that Luke, after collating ampler materials than had been used before, proposed to present a fuller and more adequate account of Jesus' ministry than had yet appeared; and (4) that the aim of his work was the confirmation of his patron, Theophilus, and of his readers, in the knowledge of the Lord's words and deeds. The au-

[1] Lk. 1:1–4.

thor does not claim a first-hand acquaintance with the life of Christ; on the contrary he ranks himself among the many writers who had already written in dependence upon the tradition which the associates of Jesus had delivered to them. Luke grounds his claim to offer a more satisfactory Gospel than had thus far appeared, upon the carefulness and scope of his investigations. He does not say that he proposed to incorporate into his Gospel materials derived from the narratives of his predecessors, but since his work and theirs rest, in great part, upon a common tradition, it is reasonable to think that he intended to avail himself of the labors of others whenever they would serve his purpose. In this Preface, then, we see reflected the motive and method of the beginnings of our evangelical literature.

The patristic testimony concerning Mark.

Can any of the earlier Gospels to which Luke refers be identified? At this point we must consult the most ancient traditions of the Church. Papias,[1] bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, whom Irenæus[2] describes as a hearer of the Apostle John, has left us this testimony concerning the Gospel of Mark: "He was the interpreter of Peter, and wrote down with accuracy, but not in chronological order, the events of Jesus' life; this he did from information given him by Peter, for he was not himself an eye-witness."[3] Later, Irenæus bears a similar testimony, telling us that Mark, a disciple and interpreter of Peter, preserved and handed down in a book the substance of Peter's preaching.[4]

[1] Flourished about 140–160 A.D.

[2] Flourished about 170–200 A.D.

[3] Eusebius, *Church History*, III, 39.

[4] *Against Heresies*, III, i, 7. With this tradition agrees well the fact that in the second Gospel the incidents of Peter's life are narrated with exceptional fulness. Mk. 1:30 ff.; 8:29 ff.; 10:28 ff.: 11:21 ff.; 14:37 ff.; 16:7.

When, now, we compare the second and third Gospels, we find that the latter is, in the main, constructed upon the framework of the former. If certain extended passages which are not common to Mark and Luke be removed,[1] it will be apparent that we have remaining essentially the same matter and in substantially the same order, in the two Gospels. A critical comparison of these two narratives makes this priority of Mark's account highly probable. A strong presumption thus arises that Mark's Gospel was one of the many earlier narratives to which Luke refers in his Prologue. How would this supposition agree with what Luke says of those narratives? He says that they were composed by those who were not themselves personal disciples of Jesus, but in accordance with information delivered to them by those who were such. He implies that they were brief narratives and that he proposed to supplement them by additional materials. All this corresponds exactly with the patristic testimony concerning Mark and with the relation of his Gospel to that of Luke which a critical comparison discloses. Mark, who was not a hearer of Jesus, incorporated in his brief narrative the accounts of Jesus' words and deeds which he was accustomed to hear from the apostle Peter. Mark's Gospel, then, was written before Luke's, and was, in all probability, one of its principal sources.

The relations of Mark and Luke.

Concerning the first Gospel we have also an important statement from Papias. He says, "Matthew composed the oracles (logia) in the Hebrew dialect, and each one interpreted them as he was able."[2] The testimony of Irenæus is to the same effect.[3] Is this description applicable to our first Gospel? If so, we

The earliest tradition concerning Matthew.

[1] *E.g.* chs. 1, 2; 6:20–8:3; 9:51–18:14.
[2] Eusebius, *Church History*, III, 39.
[3] *Against Heresies*, III, i, 1.

must suppose that our Matthew is a Greek translation of a Hebrew original. But the difficulties of this supposition are very great. Our first Gospel has none of the marks of a translation from Hebrew (or Aramaic). It is written in a smooth, clear, and uniform Greek style. There are numerous plays on Greek words[1] and verbal agreements with the Septuagint, as against the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, which make the supposition in question extremely unnatural, if not impossible. Moreover, a critical comparison of our first Gospel with the other two Synoptics makes the supposition of its composition by an eye-witness very difficult. We find that aside from the introductory chapters (1, 2) and the groups of sayings, such as the Sermon on the Mount (5–7), the instruction to the twelve (10), and the chapter of parables (13), the first Gospel, like the third, is built upon Mark. Even less than Luke does Matthew exhibit the characteristics of a primary and independent work. We are thus forced to suppose that the patristic testimonies which have been cited are applicable only to an earlier form of our first Gospel, that is, to a late Hebrew (Aramaic) writing of the Apostle Matthew which became one of the principal sources of our first Gospel and from which it derived the name which it bears — the Gospel according to Matthew.

Was the first Gospel written in Hebrew?

With this conclusion the phenomena of the Gospel strikingly agree. The Matthaic Oracles, or Logia, was evidently composed mainly of discourses and sayings. The first Gospel is distinguished by its elaborate collections of didactic matter. These materials are massed together according to the subjects on which they bear and with little reference to chronological arrangement. In illustration one has only to observe that the sayings which compose the Sermon on the

The relation of the Logia to our first Gospel.

[1] *E.g.* Matt. 24 : 30.

Mount in Matthew are distributed throughout several chapters, in various connections, in Luke. Some of these sayings are placed in such definite and appropriate historical connections by Luke that one cannot hesitate to give the preference to his chronology. Take, for example, the Lord's Prayer. Matthew places it in connection with general instructions on the nature of prayer in the Sermon on the Mount.[1] Luke assigns it to quite a different time when, in answer to the request of the disciples that the Master would teach them to pray, he gave them this form of prayer.[2] The peculiarity of the first Gospel, then, as presenting elaborate groups of sayings, agrees perfectly with the supposition that one of its principal sources was a writing which was composed mainly of the words of Jesus.

The two-source theory of the Synoptics.

The foregoing considerations yield us the elements of the two-source theory of the Synoptic Gospels. Both the first and the third Gospels are constructed mainly from the materials of Mark and of the Matthaic Logia. In the use of this common matter each evangelist proceeded in a way of his own, arranging, combining, and adjusting the discourses and narratives of his sources according to his own special purpose. Whether Mark knew and used the Logia, in addition to the preaching of Peter, is a disputed question. The supposition is not necessary to the explanation of the facts. It is also unlikely that between Matthew and Luke any direct dependence should be assumed. They narrate essentially the same events in such widely different form and order that one can scarcely suppose that either writer used the work of the other. The narratives of the infancy, the genealogies, and the account of Jesus' appearance in Nazareth are representative examples. Moreover, except in those parts

[1] Matt. 6 : 9–13. [2] Lk. 11 : 1–4.

in which both are dependent upon Mark, they pursue quite different plans in the selection and arrangement of their materials. Besides the two sources mentioned, both Matthew and Luke used other documents or memoranda of which we have no definite knowledge. Each had sources of his own for his gospel of the infancy and for his genealogy. Luke has incorporated a long narrative into the body of his Gospel, containing many of the most important sayings and deeds of Jesus, a great part of which is found in neither Mark nor Matthew.[1] In this travel-document, as it is sometimes called, we doubtless have an example of one or more of the many sources of information which Luke, according to his Preface, had carefully collated in his effort accurately to trace the course of Jesus' life from its beginning to its close.

The characteristics of Mark.

Each one of the Synoptic Gospels has marked characteristics of its own. Mark is made up mainly of graphic pictures of events in the life of Jesus. Discourses and parables are relatively less prominent. In Mark, for example, the "Sermon on the Mount" is entirely wanting. He begins his narrative with an account of the preaching of John the Baptist — the point, no doubt, at which the common apostolic tradition of Jesus' public ministry commenced. He presents nothing corresponding to the preliminary history offered by Matthew and Luke. Quite in accord with the tradition respecting its origin, the Gospel evinces a special interest for Peter, though not in any one-sided or partisan sense. The author displays no special doctrinal tendency, is quite at home in the apostolic circle in general, and depicts the gospel as destined for the whole world.[2]

The characteristics of Matthew.

In Matthew the Judeo-Christian interest is dominant. His genealogy traces the descent of Jesus from

[1] Lk. 7 : 1–18 : 15. [2] Mk. 13 : 10.

Abraham. His constant effort is to show that the events of Jesus' life happened in fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. "In order that it might be fulfilled" is a frequently recurring phrase, especially in the opening chapters.[1] But although the author was a Jew and aimed to depict the work of Christ in its organic relation to the Old Testament, it is unwarranted to ascribe to his Gospel a Judaizing "tendency." No Gospel exhibits the formal piety of the Pharisees in a more unfavorable light;[2] none lays stronger emphasis upon love to God and man as constituting the essence of religion.[3] The author has reproduced the universalistic tone of Jesus' teaching in many of its most striking expressions.[4] It cannot even be said that he wrote exclusively for Jews. His citations from the Septuagint[5] and his translation of Hebrew words[6] show that he counted upon Greek, as well as Jewish, readers.

The characteristics of Luke.

The Gospel of Luke, besides being marked by the style and tone of a practised writer, displays in an eminent degree the conviction that Christ's saving purpose was universal. In his genealogy he connects him with Adam, that is, with humanity.[7] This Gospel depicts Jesus as preëminently Saviour of the sick and the poor. He came to seek and to save that which was lost. One needs but to remember that Luke alone narrates the Parable of the Prodigal Son and the kindred parables which embody this idea,[8] in order to see how characteristic is this aspect of the third Gospel. With special fondness he describes elements of goodness in the despised Samaritans.[9] His version of the Beatitudes

[1] *E.g.* Matt. 1 : 22 ; 2 : 15, 17, 23. Cf. 21 : 1–11.
[2] Matt. 5 : 20 ; 6 : 5 ff.
[3] Matt. 22 : 34–40.
[4] Matt. 22 : 1–14 ; 28 : 19, 20.
[5] *E.g.* Matt. 13 : 35.
[6] *E.g.* Matt. 1 : 23.
[7] Lk. 3 : 38.
[8] Ch. 15
[9] Lk. 10 : 33 ff. ; 17 : 16.

represents the kingdom as a boon to the poor, the sorrowing, and the persecuted.[1] To such an extent does this Gospel emphasize the mission of Christ to the unfortunate and despised classes; so constantly does it describe him as seeking the degraded and the hopeless, that some have attributed an ascetic character to the Gospel, declaring that it makes virtues of poverty and suffering as such. This is unwarranted. Jesus did care for those for whom no one else cared. He came to the poor and the miserable. He found the "sinful" more susceptible to his truth than the "righteous." Luke has given us in this respect one of the most real and touching aspects of our Lord's mission and work.

The dates of the Synoptics.

We have no means of determining the exact dates of the Synoptic Gospels. Mark is commonly dated before the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A.D., Matthew and Luke thereafter. Zahn assigns to them the following dates: Mark, 67, Luke, 75, Matthew, in its present Greek form, 85.[2] Harnack refers Mark to the years 65–70, Matthew to the time of Jerusalem's overthrow, 70, and Luke to the period 80–93.[3] Jülicher assigns all three Synoptics to later and more indefinite periods: Mark to 70–100, Matthew to 81–96, and Luke to 80–120.[4] We cannot say anything more definite than this: Mark was probably written before 70, Matthew about 70, and Luke after 70 A.D.

The historical character and credibility of the Synoptics.

Much more important than the question of date is the question respecting the historicity and credibility of these Gospels. It is noticeable that no one of the

[1] Lk. 6 : 20–26.

[2] See the chronological table appended to his *Einleitung in das N. T.*

[3] See his *Chronologie*, Appendix. These dates, however, were taken down at his lectures.

[4] *Einleitung in das N. T.*

Synoptists makes any appeal to authority or lays any claim to a supernatural authentication of his work. No one of them places his own personality in the foreground, even to the extent of betraying his name to his readers. For a knowledge of the authors we are wholly dependent upon ecclesiastical tradition. Only the third evangelist has given us any hint respecting the method of his work and the sources of his knowledge. As we have seen, the sole claim which he makes is that, having investigated his subject carefully, he possesses the requisite historical information for writing a trustworthy narrative of the Lord's life. When we add to this claim the testimony of the earliest tradition we secure this result: Our Synoptic Gospels are based in the main upon apostolic tradition as embodied (1) in the collection of discourses which was composed by Matthew, and (2) in the narrative of the Lord's words and deeds which Mark had derived from the testimony of Peter. Although no one of these Gospels was written by an apostle or an eye-witness, they all stand in immediate connection with apostolic testimony, and were composed on the basis of tradition which had come direct to the writers from those who "from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word."[1] What better attestation, in a purely historical judgment, is desirable or possible?

Differences between the Synoptics and the fourth Gospel.

I have treated the Synoptic Gospels together on account of their obvious kinship and interdependence. As striking as their mutual resemblance is their common divergence in style, tone, and contents from the fourth Gospel. This Gospel covers quite a different area from that of the Synoptics. In John the principal scene of Jesus' labors is Jerusalem, in the Synoptics it is Galilee. Not only is the language in which Jesus' teaching is depicted widely different in the two

[1] Lk. 1:2.

sources; there is an equally noticeable difference in emphasis and contents. In the Synoptic teaching of Jesus the parables are the most striking and distinctive feature; in John we not only meet with allegories instead of parables, but we find that these two analogous forms of teaching are quite distinct in subject and purpose. In the Synoptics the teaching of Jesus is chiefly presented in short and incisive expressions; where long discourses are reported they bear all the marks of collections of sayings which have been grouped together. In John, on the contrary, the teaching is presented in the form of elaborate addresses upon definite themes, such as the discourse on the bread of life, in chapter 6, and that upon Jesus' departure and the coming of the Spirit, in chapters 14–17. In the Synoptics Jesus speaks less of himself; in John he dwells at length upon the nature and import of his own person as the unique Son of God. Instead of his speedy return to earth in power and glory, of which we read in the Synoptics, we read in John of the coming of the Holy Spirit as a substitute and compensation for his personal presence.

The fourth Gospel an interpretation rather than a report.

Such striking differences can only be explained on the supposition that the fourth Gospel is not so much a chronicle as an interpretation of Jesus' words and deeds. Tradition refers its composition to the closing years of the Apostle John, who is said to have lived till near the end of the first century. On this view of its origin the fourth Gospel would be a free version, in the terms of the writer's own thought and experience, of what the teaching and life of Jesus meant to him after a long life of reflection. It presents to us the picture of the Saviour which had become mirrored upon the soul of the evangelist during the half century or more of his devoted discipleship and service to Christ. Unlike the Synoptic tradition, it is not so

much a report of Jesus' words and deeds, as a reproduction of the meaning which his person and work had assumed for one who had long lived in the mystic contemplation and experience of his saving power.

The question of authorship.

Many scholars, however, on the ground of internal difficulties, doubt the Johannine authorship of the Gospel and assign it to the post-apostolic period. The Tubingen criticism held that it originated late in the second century. To-day a considerably earlier date is admitted by most of those who deny the Gospel to John. An increasing number of critics maintain an apostolic basis, or some form of indirect and secondary apostolic authorship, and regard it as a product of "the school of John" at Ephesus.[1] On either of the views which I have stated the Gospel would be, in its relation to the form and proportions of Jesus' teaching, a secondary source, and I have accordingly based my exposition primarily upon the Synoptic Gospels.

The peculiarities of the Johannine type of teaching.

The leading characteristics of the type of religious thought which comes to expression in the fourth Gospel are as follows: (1) The viewing of the historical as a disclosure of the divine and external. The Christ of history is constantly regarded from the standpoint of the divine nature and purpose which he reveals; his work is an expression in terms of human action and experience of the mysterious heavenly world in which his life is rooted. Even such an act as washing the disciples' feet springs from the consciousness that he came forth from God and was going again to God.[2] (2) The absolute universality of revelation. Christ's revealing, saving work represents the action of forces and laws which are eternally operative in enlightening and saving men. He is the heavenly light which lighteth every man.[3] In all ages there have been those,

[1] See Bacon, *Introduction*, ch. xi.

[2] Jn. 13 : 3. [3] Jn. 1 : 4, 9.

outside the Jewish fold, who have heard his voice and followed him.[1] (3) Strikingly comprehensive statements respecting the nature of the Christian life. All duty is comprehended in Godlikeness; to live in fellowship with God is the sum of all Christian requirements. (4) An intuitive perception of the deeper meanings of religious truth. Our author does not argue; he sees. He does not expect to convince those who have no spiritual discernment, but is confident that those whose hearts are susceptible to heavenly truth will welcome it when once it is clearly presented to them. (5) An intensely spiritual conception of religion. Our author says nothing of institutions; he has little interest in forms or rites or any of the outward accompaniments of religion. God may be worshipped with equal advantage anywhere, provided only he is worshipped in spirit and in truth.[2] The fourth Gospel is a classic expression of the reality and sufficiency of the life of the spirit.

[1] Jn. 10:16. [2] Jn. 4:24.

CHAPTER III

THE METHODS OF JESUS' TEACHING[1]

General character of Jesus' teaching.

"NEVER man so spake"[2] was the verdict of those who heard Jesus' words. There must have been a singular freshness, originality, and impressiveness in his speech. His frank, crisp, incisive utterances compelled attention, while his startling rejoinders to questions and criticisms often constituted his most effective defence. "Did ye never read what David did?"[3] "What is written in the law? how readest thou?"[4] "Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone,"[5] — these are examples of the sayings by which he met difficulties or objections more effectively than could have been done by labored arguments. How clear, simple, and pointed were many of his words! "Judge not that ye be not judged;"[6] "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath;"[7] "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil;"[8] "It is more blessed to give than to receive,"[9] — how such words as

[1] General References: Trench, Bruce, and Jülicher on the Parables (the last untranslated); Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, I, 106–172; J. H. Thayer, "The Ethical Method of Jesus," in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for December, 1900; Mathews, "On the Interpretation of Parables," in the *American Journal of Theology* for April, 1898; Sanday's article, "Jesus Christ," in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. This elaborate and valuable article contains also a concise sketch of the teaching of Jesus.

[2] Jn. 7:46.
[3] Mk. 2:35.
[4] Lk. 10:26.
[5] Jn. 8:7.
[6] Matt. 7:1.
[7] Mk. 2:27.
[8] Matt. 5:17.
[9] Acts 20:35.

these pierce to the very heart of the subject in hand! It is not strange that those who heard Jesus speak were astonished at his teaching; they had never heard anything like it before; it was not like that of their scribes.[1]

The teaching of Jesus and that of the scribes contrasted.

The methods of teaching current in Jesus' time were highly formal and scholastic. The primary subject of study was the Mosaic law, and the work of the teacher was to interpret and apply its maxims. It was assumed that all wisdom needful to man was to be found in the law; it needed but to be elicited by ingenious exegesis. When, therefore, some problem or situation presented itself for which the law did not offer a clear solution, the answer was sought in some occult meaning. Thus grew up a fantastic system of allegorical interpretation which derived as many meanings from Scripture as the circumstances required. While graver moral considerations were not wholly overlooked, the questions to which the maxims and distinctions which were deduced by this process from the law were applied were largely petty and trifling. They concerned such things as the breadth of phylacteries, the washing of cups and platters, and the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin.[2] Profoundly earnest as were great rabbis like Hillel and Jochanan ben Zaccai, and noble as are many of its counsels, the tendency of Pharisaism was toward religious exclusiveness and the preference of rule to impulse. Even the recognition of the *yetser ha ra* and the *yetser ha tob*, — the evil and the good tendency of the flesh and soul respectively, — which must always prevent indiscriminate condemnation of Judaism, did not avail to check the drift toward academic morality, with its unavoidable accompaniments of pride and professionalism on the part of the rabbis as a class. It was, indeed,

[1] Mk. 1:22.

[2] Matt. 23:5, 23; Mk. 7:4.

all but inevitable that their teaching should show an increasing disregard of originality, the fundamental elements of morality, and, above all, the abiding presence of God. The teaching of Jesus was as different from this as the temple of the skies under which he taught was different from the narrow room where the scribe taught his pupils.[1]

Jesus' manner of instructing his disciples.

When we open the Gospels and see Jesus at his work of teaching, we observe how perfectly informal and natural his method is. We find him standing or sitting in the midst of his pupils, speaking to them familiarly and answering their questions. "And when he had sat down, his disciples came unto him, and he opened his mouth and taught them";[2] "And he answered them, saying,"[3] — such phases reflect the naturalness of his method. Once when the multitude thronged him he entered a fishing-boat, and taught the people assembled on the lake shore.[4] His method was strikingly simple, spontaneous, and free.[5]

The authoritativeness of his teaching.

Unlike the religious teachers of his time, Jesus taught with an authority of his own. He did not proceed, as did the scribes, by rehearsing the sayings of others, and drawing out inferences from their words. He spoke from the conscious possession of truth in himself. His teaching flowed forth from the clear, pure fountain of knowledge within. His certitude was not derived from others: it was his own. He uttered

[1] Cf. Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ch. 18; Stapfer, *Palestine in the Time of Christ*, Bk. II, ch. iii; Mathews, *N. T. Times in Palestine*, 161, 162.

[2] Matt. 5:1.

[3] *E.g.* Matt. 16:2, *et al.*

[4] Mk. 4:1.

[5] "A mode of teaching which aims at popular intelligibility is exposed to the risk of degenerating into platitude and triviality, and one which aims at pregnant brevity easily becomes stilted and obscure. But Jesus perfectly combined the two qualities, and by this very means attained a peculiar and classic beauty of style." — Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, I, 109.

his truths with a calm, unclouded conviction which was the product, not of argument, but of spiritual intuition. He did not claim to possess all knowledge; upon many themes he refrained from pronouncing judgment; they lay outside the scope of his work as the Founder of the kingdom of God. But within the field of religion he spoke with all the accents of certainty and authority. "Verily, verily, I say unto you" was the keynote of his sayings concerning God and man and duty. The men of old time or of the present may have said this or that, "but I say unto you"[1] — that was the tone in which he uttered his instruction.[2]

His dialectic.

The method of Jesus was not controversial. He saw the truth and declared it; he was little disposed to argue about it. He assumed that the truths which he had to teach were the truths of man's own nature, that they shone in their own light, and were not made more evident by elaborate discussion and argument. Still, he was often drawn into discussion by his critics and opponents, and was obliged to correct their misunderstandings or expose their fallacies. Let us note a few examples of his dialectic. When the scribes criticised him for associating with men who had no social standing, his reply was, "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners."[3] The parables in Luke 15, in which he shows how men seek that which is lost, were uttered in refutation of the same objection and in justification of his method. He thus lays bare the motives of his critics in their whole attitude toward others, and places in clearest contrast with them his own. Again, when he was accused of profaning the sabbath, his answer was that those who

Illustrations of his mode of argument.

[1] Matt. 5 : 22, *et al.*

[2] Cf. Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, pp. 22 23.

[3] Mk. 2 : 17.

objected to the plucking of ears of grain by his hungry disciples on the sabbath had confused the whole subject by conceiving of the sabbath as an end to which man was a means, instead of a means for promoting the good of man.[1] Other representative examples of the way in which he dealt with questions or objections are found in his description of the character and scope of true neighbor love in the parable of the Good Samaritan;[2] his demand for a great act of self-sacrifice in the case of the rich young ruler, who claimed that he had fulfilled all the divine requirements;[3] his reply about giving tribute to Cæsar;[4] and his answer, based on their own sacred law, to the objection made by the Sadducees to the idea of a resurrection.[5] What one especially notes in these conversations and disputes is Jesus' frank and candid treatment of his critics and of their questions. There is no evasion of the real point at issue, no oversubtlety, no taking of an unfair advantage. Every point is treated with as much seriousness as acumen; every difficulty is met and considered in a manner which evinces a pure love of truth.

Three principal outward forms of Jesus' teaching.

In the Synoptic Gospels the teaching of Jesus is represented as having taken three principal outward forms. These are the pithy, sententious saying, the outward action, and the parable. In the fourth Gospel, as we have seen,[6] his teaching appears more in the form of extended discourses and allegories. Let us more closely observe these three Synoptic forms of his teaching in order.

Examples of the "wisdom" of Jesus.

Examples of those short, crisp sayings in which he was accustomed to embody his instruction, are as follows: "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you";[7] "Many that are first shall be last;

[1] Mk. 2:27. [2] Lk. 10:30–37. [3] Mk. 10:17 ff. [4] Mk. 12:17. [5] Mk. 12:26, 27. [6] P. 30. [7] Mk. 4:24.

and the last first";[1] "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted";[2] "Whosoever would save his life shall lose it," etc.;[3] "Many are called, but few chosen."[4]

His use of paradox.

It will be noticed how many of these sayings are paradoxical in form. They strike the ear and arrest special attention by their bold divergence from the common judgments of men. Their suggestiveness and force arise from the contrast which they point between a lower and a higher meaning of the terms employed. For example, many who had been earliest and foremost in outward attachment to Jesus would finally come farthest short of fulfilling the demands of the Christlike life.[5] He who selfishly seeks prominence will fail of the true exaltation which consists in the esteem of men, and, above all, in the favor of God.[6] In its form this type of Jesus' teaching resembled the method, long current in the Jewish schools, of embodying moral and religious truth in pointed proverbs and maxims. Such sayings may be called the "wisdom" of Jesus;[7] they represent the perfection of that mode of teaching which is illustrated in the sapiential books of the Old Testament.[8]

Teaching by action.

Examples of the way in which Jesus taught by action are seen in his taking a child in his arms in order to emphasize the necessity of childlikeness in those who would be members of his kingdom,[9] and in his washing of the disciples' feet as an object-les-

[1] Mk. 10:31. [3] Mk. 8:35. [5] Mk. 10:31.
[2] Lk. 14:11. [4] Matt. 21:14. [6] Lk. 14:11.

[7] See Professor C. A. Briggs, on "The Wisdom of Jesus," in *The Expository Times*, June–August, 1897.

[8] On the "Wisdom Literature," see Schürer's *History*, *passim;* Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, pp. 117 ff., and Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (consult Index). All these works contain ample references to the literature of the subject.

[9] Mk. 9:33 ff.

son in humility.[1] The cursing of the barren fig tree[2] may be called a parable in action on account of the dramatic and didactic character and object of the action. The miracles of Jesus may also be reckoned among the methods of his teaching, since they were never mere exhibitions of power, but were regarded by him as a part of his revealing, saving work — a method of disclosing the grace of God which wrought in his beneficent ministry.[3]

Jesus' use of parables

But of all the methods of teaching which Jesus employed the parable is the most characteristic and striking. A parable is a narrative of some real or imaginary event in nature or in common life, which is adapted to suggest a moral or religious truth. The parable rests upon some correspondence, more or less exact, between events in nature or in human experience and the truths of religion. Two general classes of parables may be distinguished: (1) those in which some fact in the actual world is adduced as illustrating a moral or religious principle; and, (2) those in which some imagined event — which might naturally happen — is narrated to illustrate a spiritual truth or process. Examples of the former sort of parables are: "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick";[4] "Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?"[5] and the sayings about the sewing of undressed cloth upon an old garment,[6] about the division of a kingdom against itself,[7] and about the putting of the lamp under the bushel, or under the bed, instead

[1] Jn. 13 : 12 ff.

[2] Mk. 11 : 13 ff.

[3] See Matt. 11 : 5, 21, 22; Jn. 14 : 10. On the didactic import of Jesus' miracles, see Weiss, *Life of Christ*, Vol. II, Bk. II, ch. vii.

[4] Mk. 2 : 17.

[5] Mk. 2 : 19.

[6] Mk. 2 : 21.

[7] Mk. 3 : 24.

of upon the lamp-stand.[1] In John also this species of parable is found, as in 3 : 8 and in 12 : 24.

Parable-germs.

These forms of teaching are brief, undeveloped parables; they have been sometimes called "parable-germs." They are not elaborated into a narrative or story, but are succinct statements of natural events or customs which readily suggest some religious fact or principle. In popular usage these "parable-germs" are not generally spoken of as parables at all; but it is evident that they really come under that designation, and they are sometimes so called in the New Testament (*e.g.* in Mk. 3 : 23).

Parable-stories.

It is the second class of parables — the parable-stories — which excite the most interest in the New Testament student. Their vivid, pictorial character is especially adapted to impress the imagination. No parts of Jesus' teaching are so easily remembered as the parables. Such pictures as those of the sower going forth to sow,[2] of the laborers in the vineyard,[3] and of the returning prodigal,[4] are photographed upon the mind of every reader of the New Testament.

Difference between the parable and the fable.

The nature of the parable can, perhaps, be best illustrated by comparing it briefly with some other figurative forms of speech. The difference between the parable and the *fable* is readily observed. The fable moves on a lower plane. It is less serious and dignified, both in its choice of material and in the lesson which it aims to teach. One need but recall the fables of Æsop in illustration. They are mainly constructed out of impossible transactions and conversations of animals. The lessons which they teach are, for the most part, lessons of prudential morality. The parable, on the other hand, — at least, as Jesus uses it, — is devoted to teaching the highest spiritual

[1] Mk. 4 : 21.
[2] Mk. 4 : 3 ff.
[3] Matt. 21 : 28 ff.
[4] Lk. 15 : 11 ff.

truths. Moreover, it is constructed of what I may call natural materials, events which either happen in nature or life, or circumstances which might occur without the least violation of reason or nature. The fable, then, is a product of free fancy teaching a prudential lesson; the parable is a natural narrative teaching some deep moral or religious principle.

The parable and the myth.

Even more widely does the parable differ from the *myth*. Let the reader recall the myths of the Homeric poems, the fanciful stories of gods and heroes which constitute the early literature of the Greeks. When we read them in our youth we often wondered whether they were all true, or all false, or half true and half false. In the myth the truth intended to be conveyed and the story employed to convey it are identified. The myth wears the guise of truth. It offers itself to us as the truth, and affords us no ready means of distinguishing, as respects its truthfulness, between its form and its substance. In the myth the fancy loses the truth in its own creations. The parable, on the contrary, carefully preserves the distinction between its form, the parable-story, and its essence, the spiritual truth intended to be illustrated. Although both the myth and the parable are forms of fiction, they differ very widely, since the myth is far removed from our common human nature and reason, while the parable keeps close to them.

The parable and the proverb.

The *proverb* differs from the parable, as a rule, in being briefer. The proverb commonly relates to custom and to practical wisdom, and seldom deals with truths which are distinctly religious. The proverb may, however, be figurative or parabolic in form and capable of being elaborated into a parable. Such a proverb is seen in the words, "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch."[1] A parable

[1] Matt. 15:14.

might certainly be constructed by developing in a narrative form the idea of one blind man leading another, in such a way as to teach the importance of seeking trustworthy guidance in life and duty.

The parable and the allegory.

The *allegory* is the form of speech which most closely resembles the parable. The narrative about the door of the sheepfold in John 10 is an allegory. The allegory identifies the symbol and the thing signified, for example, "I *am* the door"; "I *am* the true vine." The parable, on the other hand, keeps these distinct. The allegory hides the truth in the figurative form; the parable suggests it. Trench illustrates the difference by saying that, "Behold the Lamb of God"[1] is allegorical, because Christ is *identified* with the Lamb, while "Brought as a lamb to the slaughter"[2] is parabolical, because it is a comparison and not an identification.[3] It will thus be seen that an allegory needs no interpretation, since it carries its meaning on its surface, whereas the meaning of a parable, being only *suggested*, may be more or less evident.[4]

How are parables to be interpreted?

On what principles are parables to be interpreted? The most diverse methods have been employed among

[1] Jn. 1:36. [2] Is. 53:7.

[3] *On the Parables*, p. 9.

[4] Trench has summarized the differences of which I have been speaking thus: "To sum up all, then, the parable differs from the fable, moving as it does in a spiritual world, and never transgressing the actual order of things natural — from the *mythus*, there being in the latter an unconscious blending of the deeper meaning with the outward symbol, while the two remain separate and separable in the parable — from the proverb, inasmuch as it is more fully carried out, and not accidentally and occasionally, but necessarily figurative — from the allegory, comparing as it does one thing *with* another, but at the same time preserving them apart as an inner and an outer, and not transferring, as does the allegory, the properties and qualities and relations of one *to* the other." — *On the Parables*, p. 10.

scholars in seeking their meaning, and a great variety of results have been derived from them in popular Christian teaching. The commonest error of interpreters is to apply the "allegorical" method to the parables, that is, to seek to find some special and distinct meaning in each detail of the parable-story. To some of the parables this method can be applied with fairly plausible results, either because the parable is so simple or compact in character that it makes one indivisible picture, or because the analogy used happens to be especially complete and many-sided. In other cases, however, this method breaks down entirely. Take, for example, the parable of the rich man and the steward in Luke 16 : 1 ff. Whom does the rich man represent? Some say *God*; others, the *Romans*; others, *mammon*; still others, *the devil*, and these are but a few of the answers that have been given. Who is the steward? We find a similar variety of answers: *the wealthy*, *the Israelitish people*, *sinners*, and even *Judas Iscariot*.[1]

Vagaries of interpretation.

It is obvious that there could hardly be such wide diversity of opinion as this if there were any test or measure for determining the meaning of these terms. The truth is that it makes no difference who the rich man is, or who the steward is. They represent no particular persons; that is to say, the point of the parable does not depend at all upon finding a counterpart for these persons. They are necessary to the parable-story, but the meaning of the parable turns on what the steward *says*, and not on who he *is*. He may

[1] Many of the earlier interpreters identify the two pence, which the Good Samaritan gave to the host (Lk. 10 : 35), with the two sacraments. Vitringa makes the servant who owed ten thousand talents (Matt. 18 : 23) to mean the Pope, and the whole parable a picture of events in mediæval history. In like manner, the pearl of great price (Matt. 13 : 46) is the doctrine of Calvin!

be anybody, and his master may be anybody; it is the *action*, and not the *personnel*, of the parable which contains its lesson. That this is so is seen from the eighth and ninth verses. The shrewdness of the steward's action may teach a wholesome lesson in the right use of wealth, although the dishonesty of his method cannot be commended.

Absurd consequences of the allegorical method.

There is no limit to the fanciful results which have been drawn from the parables in the effort to make every character which is introduced into them represent some particular person in the application. Whom do the ten virgins represent? Who is the merchant seeking goodly pearls? Who is the woman who puts the leaven in the meal, and who is the one who sweeps the house in search of the lost piece of money? No answers are to be sought to such questions. The force of the parables just alluded to depends upon the principle which the action described illustrates.

A test case.

Let the reader test for himself the applicability of the allegorical method by trying it in the case of the parable of the unjust judge.[1] Who is the judge? He cannot be God, for he is an unjust judge, who neither fears God nor regards man. Who is the widow? She cannot represent the Christian in prayer, for she is a troublesome and shameless person who threatens the judge with personal violence[2] in case he does not grant her request. It will be found that we have here a picture which is designed to teach by the contrast of the two situations the certainty that prayer will be answered. If an unjust judge, all whose qualities are the very opposite of the character of God, at length grants the persistent applicant her

[1] Lk. 18:2 ff.

[2] See the margin of the Revised Version on Lk. 18:5. Meyer renders: "That she may not at last come and beat my face black and blue." *In loco.*

request, not from any interest in her case, — for he neither fears God nor regards man, — but solely to escape further annoyance or danger, how much more will the gracious and loving God, our Father, grant the earnest request of his children! This is an example of a parable which is constructed more upon a contrast than upon a resemblance. To what absurdity, then, must the effort to treat all its terms as having a spiritual parallel conduct the interpreter.

The general principle of interpretation to be observed.

A sound general principle for the interpretation of the parable is that it is intended to teach one single truth. The parallel between the story which embodies this truth and its spiritual counterpart may be more or less complete. The point of the teaching may lie in the whole picture which the parable presents, or it may lie in some single aspect or element of the picture. No rule for accurately measuring the range of the correspondence can be laid down. The parable of the Prodigal Son and that of the Sower are examples of parables whose significance is found in the entire picture which they present. No violence is therefore done in assigning a didactic value in interpretation even to the details of the parable-story; in fact, we find that our Lord himself does this in explaining the import of the parable of the Sower.

The general theme of the parables.

The general subject with which the parables most commonly deal is the kingdom of God. The numerous parables which comprise the thirteenth chapter of Matthew are good illustrations. Sometimes the parables go together in pairs, teaching two closely related aspects of the same general truth. Examples are found in the parables of the Mustard Seed and of the Leaven,[1] in the parabolic sayings about the piece of undressed cloth and the new wine,[2] and in the kindred

[1] Lk. 13:18–21.
[2] Mk. 2:21, 22.

but distinguishable allegories of the Door of the Sheepfold[1] and of the Good Shepherd.[2]

The popular power of Jesus' methods.

From these illustrations of the methods of Jesus in teaching we gain some impression of the real simplicity, concreteness, and pointedness of his instruction. Though unconventional and levelled to the needs and understandings of plain men, it dealt with the loftiest spiritual truth. It remains to all time the peerless model of religious teaching. No wonder that the common people listened eagerly to his words;[3] no wonder that the multitudes, who had been accustomed to the subtleties and sophistries of the scribes, "were astonished at his teaching."[4]

[1] Jn. 10 : 1–10.
[2] Jn. 10 : 11–18.
[3] Mk. 12 : 3.
[4] Matt. 7 : 28.

CHAPTER IV

JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD THE OLD TESTAMENT[1]

Jesus builds upon the Old Testament.

In his teaching Jesus took his stand distinctly upon the Old Testament. He frequently quoted its language, and illustrated and enforced his truths by appeal to its authority. He regarded his own teaching and work as standing in close historical connection with the religion of Israel. The heavenly Father of whom he spoke was no other than the God whom the Jews worshipped. "We [Jews] worship that which we know: for salvation is from the Jews,"[2] is a succinct statement of Jesus' attitude toward the Old Covenant as exhibited in his life. He assumed that a special revelation of God had been given in the history of the Jewish people, and that their career had been a providential preparation for the Messiah. He had no idea of establishing a wholly new religion. There is no part of his teaching which does not have its roots in the religion of Israel; nothing which is not a legitimate development, a completion of elements

[1] General References: I refer here, in general, to the *Theologies of the New Testament*, by Weiss, Beyschlag, Stevens, Holtzmann, Gould, and Estes, to Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*, and to Bruce's *Kingdom of God*, in all of which, under the appropriate heading, a discussion, more or less complete, of each topic pertaining to the subject of our study will be found. See also, for the present theme: Mackintosh, *Christ and the Jewish Law;* Alexander, *The Son of Man*, ch. xi, on "Jesus and the Old Testament"; Jacob, *Jesu Stellung zum mosaischen Gesetz*, and the works of Schürer and Bousset cited under Ch. I.

[2] Jn. 4 : 22.

of truth which were contained in the Old Testament.[1] This attitude of Jesus toward his ancestral religion we shall have frequent occasion to illustrate in the study of the topics which are to follow.

The legal and the prophetic tendencies in Judaism.

Did Jesus, then, make no discrimination among the different parts of the Old Testament and among the various religious institutions of his people? When we look into the Old Testament we find that its books illustrate chiefly two great general tendencies of thought and life — the legal and the moral. The ceremonial system which is detailed in the Pentateuch furnishes the classic example of the one; the writings of the prophets the best illustration of the other. This twofold tendency became even more marked in the later Judaism. We have seen that in the time of Jesus the legal method of thought was dominant in Israel. The spirit of prophecy had departed, and, while there were individuals of deep spirituality, in the mass of the nation legalism and ritualism reigned supreme.

Jesus' attitude toward these tendencies.

While our Lord made no criticism upon the ceremonial system as a whole, or upon its special institutions as such, it is evident from the whole tone and drift of his teaching that he allied himself with the moral and prophetic, rather than with the legal, tendency in religious thought and life. How remarkable is it, for example, that, so far as the Gospels inform us, Jesus never mentioned circumcision,[2] the rite in which the Jews gloried[3] and which was to them the symbol of all that they deemed most characteristic in their religion. No Jewish religious teacher in that

[1] "Nowhere do we find him stating and teaching anything as to the nature of God which was impossible on the basis of the Old Testament religion." — WENDT, *Teaching*, I, 184.

[2] That is, in the Synoptics; the one reference in John (7 : 22, 23) is purely incidental.

[3] Gal. 6 : 12–15.

age could have made such an omission unless he had possessed unique and original views of the nature and requirements of the religious life.[1]

Jesus' general estimate of the Old Testament.

It is also evident that Jesus' view of the divineness of the Old Testament system did not involve its perfection. He regarded it as having a preparatory and partial character. The maxim which he applied to the development of his kingdom, "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear,"[2] would have been applicable here. Incidental to a progressive revelation and in consequence of the limitations of its media and its recipients, there are imperfections in the maxims and customs which are sanctioned by the law. The Mosaic system permitted men to put away their wives on terms which Jesus would not sanction. "For your hardness of heart," said Jesus, "he [Moses] wrote you this commandment";[3] that is, it was a law which was adapted to a rude state of society — a useful, restrictive regulation in its time, but based upon an inadequate idea of the true nature and sacredness of marriage. The "men of old time"[4] — the lawgivers of ancient Israel — sanctioned such legal rules as, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth";[5] but Jesus laid down a very different principle respecting the treatment of those who do us injury. No contrast could be more pointed: "The ancients said" this or that; "but I say unto you" something quite different.

On what principle can this apparent contradiction

[1] The student will find full discussions of the relation of Jesus to contemporary religious thought and of his originality in the treatises of Schürer and Bousset on the *Preaching of Jesus*, already cited (see p. 1). Unfortunately, they are not translated.

[2] Mk. 4 : 28. [3] Mk. 10 : 5. [4] Matt. 5 : 21.

[5] Matt. 5 : 38. Cf. Ex. 21 : 24, 25; Lev. 24 : 19, 20; Deut. 19 : 21.

Apparent contradiction in Jesus' attitude.

be resolved? How can the Old Testament be sacred and its contents divine, and yet be marred by imperfect laws or defective maxims? How can we explain this seemingly double-faced attitude? How adjust the conservatism and the radicalism of Jesus?

Its solution.

The answer must be that he regarded the Old Testament quite differently from the men of his time. With them it meant an outer word — a body of rules, commandments, and prohibitions, enjoining and forbidding certain specific acts; for him the Old Testament meant the purpose of God as disclosed in Israel's history — the voice of God which spoke to the heart and the conscience through lawgiver and prophet. Jesus penetrated to the heart of the Scriptures and dealt with the changeless spiritual laws or principles in which real religion has its basis. With the outward, the incidental, the temporary, he did not greatly concern himself. He was as little of a zealot as he was of a revolutionary. He neither sided with the technically religious or orthodox Pharisees, nor did he attack the law because of the perversions and superficial interpretations of it which were current. His method was that of penetrating to the real essence of the law; it was the method of comprehension by which he was able to grasp into the unity of a great spiritual principle the essence of all commandments, as when he taught that love to God and man is the substance of all that the law and the prophets contained.[1]

His view of fasting.

Let us observe the method of Jesus in dealing with certain usages and institutions of Judaism. Frequent fasting was a religious custom which was greatly emphasized in the time of Jesus.[2] It was

[1] Matt. 22:37–40.

[2] The Old Testament prescribed but one fast, that on the great day of atonement (Lev. 16:29). Possibly a later insti-

one of the marks of a zealous piety.[1] Jesus did not adopt it or encourage his disciples to do so.[2] When asked his reason for not doing so, his reply, in substance, was, that fasting was only appropriate in times of special bereavement and sorrow, that during the joyful days of his presence with his disciples there would be no fitness in fasting.[3] The parabolic sayings which follow about the piece of new cloth and the new wine clearly set forth the principle that what he sought to quicken in men was a new, free, spiritual life upon which the burden of a round of outward observances was not to be imposed. Jesus neither forbids nor enjoins fasting. He insists that, *if practised*, it shall have a real meaning; it shall not be a mere ceremony, but a "fasting unto God,"[4] an expression of real contrition in the sight of God.[5]

The sacrificial system.

What was Jesus' attitude toward the sacrificial system which was the central feature of the Jewish ritual? On the one hand, he is represented as attending the feasts in connection with which sacrifices were offered;[6] had he not been present at the sacrificial worship he would have given great offence, and the fact must have left some trace of itself on the pages of the New Testament.[7] On the other hand, he is not represented as himself bringing offerings to the temple, and but once as counselling it in the case of others.[8] In this in-

tuted fast is referred to in Est. 4:3, 16. Jesus may have observed the *regular* fasts.

[1] "I fast twice in the week" (Lk. 18:12). See article, "Fasting" in Hastings' *B. D.*; Stapfer, *Palestine*, pp. 379–382.

[2] Mk. 2:18.

[3] Mk. 2:19; Matt. 9:15; Lk. 5:34.

[4] Zech. 7:5.

[5] Matt. 6:16–18.

[6] Lk. 22:1; Jn. 4:45; 5:1; 6:4; 7:2, 8; 11:56; 13:1, 29.

[7] See Weiss, *Life of Christ*, II, 165, 166.

[8] Mk. 1:44; Matt. 8:4; Lk. 5:14.

stance, — in connection with the healing of a leper, — the interest of Jesus in the matter seemed to centre in the procuring by the man of a certificate of cleansing for which the sacrifice was necessary. "Offer the necessary sacrifice in order that you may be certified by the priest and accepted by the people as really clean" — seems to represent the real emphasis of Jesus' words.

"Mercy and not sacrifice."

In any case it is certain that Jesus laid no stress upon sacrificial rites, else he could not have been so silent on the subject. He echoed the teaching of the prophets, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice,"[1] and declared that to love God with all the heart and one's neighbor as himself "is much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices."[2] In the same spirit he counselled that a man who, in the very act of offering a sacrifice, remembered that he had wronged a fellow-man, should leave his gift to God unoffered and go and right the wrong.[3]

The underlying principle.

Scanty as these references are, there can be little doubt respecting the attitude of mind which is expressed in them. Jesus did not oppose the temple ritual, but he took little interest in it. He resented, indeed, the profanation of the temple, but it was upon the temple as a house of prayer, rather than as a seat of sacrifice, that his zeal was concentrated. The world in which he lived and that of Jewish ceremonialism scarcely touched each other. The words which represented the religious ideals of his age were such as sacrifice, fasting, tithes, and almsgiving, while his were judgment, mercy, and the love of God,[4] and after surveying the painstaking piety of his contemporaries and their zeal in legal obedience, he said plainly to his

[1] Matt. 9:13; 12:7. Cf. Hos. 6:6; Mic. 6:6–8.
[2] Mk. 12:33. [3] Matt. 5:23, 24. [4] Lk. 11:42.

disciples, "Except your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."[1]

The law of clean and unclean.

Regarding the law of clean and unclean, Jesus took up a more positive attitude. He declared that "there is nothing from without the man that going into him can defile him."[2] Is this only a rejection of "the tradition of the elders"[3] — "the human statutes with which the law had been enlarged by Pharisaic learning"?[4] The maxim seems to me to have a wider sweep than this view admits. It was so understood by Mark, who adds: "*This he said*, making all meats clean."[5] The language of Jesus, while finding its occasion in the popular refinements of Leviticalism, was quite unqualified. It cannot mean less than that the Mosaic law of purification is a matter of moral indifference. The law had prescribed in detail what foods, if eaten, defiled a man; Jesus refuses to recognize the distinction of clean and unclean, except in the ethical sphere. Logically his principle undermines the whole system of ceremonial defilement.[6]

The sabbath question.

The sabbath was the institution which the Jews of Jesus' time had safeguarded with the most minute and stringent rules. The ordinances of the Pentateuch[7] were not wanting in strictness or detail, but the doctors of the law had developed upon the basis of these an elaborate system of distinctions, exactions, and prohibitions.[8] Early in his ministry Jesus encountered the criticism of his contemporaries by permitting his disciples to violate one of the conventional

[1] Matt. 5:20. [2] Mk. 7:15. [3] Matt. 7:4.
[4] Weiss, *Life of Christ*, II, 167. [5] Mk. 7:19.
[6] Cf. Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, pp. 69, 70.
[7] Ex. 20:8–11; 23:12; 31:12–17; 34:21; 35:1–3; Deut. 5:12–15.
[8] See Stapfer, *Palestine*, pp. 350–357.

rules governing sabbath observance.[1] In his reply he appealed, at first, to precedent — the liberty exercised by David in eating bread which the law permitted only the priests to eat — and then to the principle that the sabbath was not an end, but a means to an end. That end is man — his real interests and needs.[2] He repudiates all rules which place the sabbath above human interests or make it a hindrance, rather than a help, to their promotion.

The scope of the principle of Jesus.

It is evident that in his reply Jesus meant to repudiate those refinements which had been developed on the basis of the law, and to show that he and his disciples were not really sabbath-breakers. But does not the principle which he announced reach farther than this? The maxims, "It is permitted to do good on the sabbath day,"[3] and: "The sabbath was made on man's account, and not man on the sabbath's account,"[4] have quite a different tone from this: "Whosoever doeth any work therein [*i.e.* on the sabbath] shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day."[5] Who can believe that Jesus would have sanctioned the stoning to death of a man for gathering sticks to make a fire on the sabbath day?[6] One thing is certain: if such methods of securing to men a day of rest and worship were not adapted to promote the true good of mankind, they are excluded by the principle of Jesus. Upon this concrete question our Lord did not pronounce. He did, however, propound the test of all sabbath rules and usages, even of those contained in the Old Testament.

The principle of fulfilment.

How, then, shall we define the attitude toward the Old Testament which these examples illustrate?

[1] Mk. 2:23 ff.; Matt. 12:1 ff.; Lk. 6:1 ff.
[2] Mk. 2:27. [3] Matt. 12:12. [4] Mk. 2:27.
[5] Ex. 35:2, 3. [6] Num. 15:32–36.

What principle is adequate to cover both his conservative and his independent handling of Old Testament rules and maxims? The answer is: His own principle of fulfilment — "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil."[1] Jesus did not intend to discard the Jewish system and to begin *de novo*. He would build upon its essential substance of truth. He foresaw the danger that many would regard his independence as involving a complete break with Judaism. Against this radical interpretation of his mission he sought to guard. Nothing in the law is to be thrown away as worthless and useless. The true spiritual meaning and use of its various requirements and institutions are rather to be developed and enforced. Not a jot or a tittle shall fail of its fulfilment in the teaching and work of the Messiah.

Examples of fulfilment: Anger.

Several additional examples of our Lord's method of fulfilling the law in his teaching have been preserved to us: "It was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; but I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment,"[2] etc. The law forbade the overt act of murder; Jesus, penetrating to the world of motives, out of which all overt acts spring, forbids the indulgence of the passion which is the fruitful source of murder.

Impure desire.

In like manner the law forbade adultery; Jesus forbids the impure desire.[3]

Oaths.

The law emphasized the sanctity of oaths; Jesus declares that one's simple word should be as sacred and inviolable as the most solemn pledge.[4]

Prohibition of revenge.

The law sanctioned retaliation — the payment of penalty in kind — in its maxims, "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth"; Jesus discountenances revenge altogether, enjoining upon his disci-

The law of love.

[1] Matt. 5 : 17.
[2] Matt. 5 : 21, 22.
[3] Matt. 5 : 27 ff.
[4] Matt. 5 : 33 ff.

ples the patient endurance of injury rather than its requital.[1] The law required men to love their neighbors; and while it did not add, "and hate their enemies," still, the tendency of certain texts[2] was to foster a strong aversion to non-Jews. Jesus, however, enjoins universal love. Such love alone is Godlike, for God blesses all, even the worst of men. Only by the possession and exercise of this love can men become the sons of their Father in heaven. Hence he commands his disciples not to be grudging and partial in their benevolence, — making their love only a mitigated selfishness, — but to be complete, impartial, and generous in their love, as God is in his, thereby proving themselves to be morally kindred to him in spirit and action.[3] One of Jesus' most striking parables, — that of the Good Samaritan,[4] — is designed to illustrate and enforce the same truth.

The meaning of fulfilment.

Thus Jesus' fulfilment of the Jewish law meant the development of its ideal contents, the realization in his own teaching and life of the essential spiritual principles which underlay the Mosaic legislation. This legislation was a partial and temporary reproduction of those changeless laws and truths which constituted the spiritual instruction of Christ.[5] In the process of

[1] Matt. 5 : 38 ff.

[2] Lev. 19 : 18, "Thou shalt not bear any grudge against *the children of thy people*"; Ex. 23 : 22, "I will be an enemy unto thine enemies," etc. The popular conception of Israel's election and of his security in the favor of God which was current in late Judaism powerfully contributed to the idea that "neighbor" meant fellow-Jew, and that love to one's neighbors meant hatred toward one's enemies.

[3] Matt. 5 : 43 ff. [4] Lk. 10 : 30–37.

[5] Hence his fulfilment of the law was something more than the personal realization of the Old Testament's moral ideal, the perfect revelation of God's righteousness, as maintained by Mackintosh, *Christ and the Jewish Law*, ch. ii.

educing its permanent spiritual contents, therefore, all that was provisional would fall away, — not by being destroyed, but by being fulfilled. Everything that was of permanent validity was conserved; that which was specifically Jewish, and so fitted only for a limited and temporary use, fell away, as the blossom falls away when it is fulfilled in the fruit.

The kernel and the husk.

How completely did the interest of Jesus centre in the inner and deeper meanings of things. Not the husk, but the kernel, was that for which he cared. What slight regard did he show to the whole ceremonial system of his people. He looked upon it as a husk, containing, indeed, great abiding truths, but itself destined to pass away as its inner meaning became known and effective through his work.

How Jesus spiritualized the law.

We shall have frequent occasion in the ensuing study to observe how Jesus penetrated to the deeper meaning of Old Testament conceptions, such as the fatherhood of God and the kingdom of God. The current form in which these ideas were conceived constituted at once his point of contact and his point of departure. He made use of the prevailing modes of speech and of thought, but in his use of them he enlarged, deepened, and spiritualized them, and thus delivered the essential truths expressed in them from the limitations in which they had been apprehended, and clothed them in forms universally valid.

CHAPTER V

THE KINGDOM OF GOD[1]

The idea of the kingdom in the teaching of Jesus.

Jesus began the proclamation of his gospel by saying: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand."[2] The idea of the kingdom, therefore, occupied a primary place in his thoughts and plans, and may justly be regarded as the dominant note of his teaching. It is an idea which Jesus was always emphasizing and illustrating in its various phases and applications. That men should recognize God in their life, that they should live in accord with his truth and law, was the first concern of Jesus. The alternative term, "kingdom of heaven," which Matthew employs,[3] embodies, generically, the same idea. The kingdom is heavenly, that is, divine in origin and

[1] General References: Candlish, *The Kingdom of God, Biblically and Historically considered;* Mathews, *The Social Teaching of Jesus*, ch. iii; Kidd, *Morality and Religion*, Lect. VIII; Denney, *Studies in Theology*, ch. viii; Horton, *Teaching of Jesus*, ch. i; Krop, *La Pensée de Jésus sur le Royaume de Dieu;* Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, chs. iii, iv; Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, pp. 34–40; treatises (in German) by Issel, Schmoller, J. Weiss, Titius, Lütgert; see also the general literature cited under Ch. IV.

[2] Mk. 1 : 15.

[3] The title occurs thirty-two times in Matthew, not at all in the other two Synoptics. "Kingdom of God" is found, however, in Matt. 12 : 28 and 21 : 31, 43. Some account for the phrase by referring to the fact that "Heaven" was a common Jewish metonymy for "God" (so Schürer, Wendt, Sanday, Dalman); but it is quite as likely that τῶν οὐρανῶν is simply the genitive of origin.

character. Its law is the will of God; it is the reign of heavenly principles and laws.

Old Testament idea of the kingdom of God.

The idea of the kingdom of God was a prominent one in the Old Testament and in the late Judaism. The Jews regarded their own state as a kingdom of God, a theocracy. The most distinguishing peculiarity of Jewish religious thought was that the people considered Jehovah to be their king, and contemplated their whole system of laws and institutions as the direct expression of his will. They regarded their rulers and magistrates as Jehovah's vicegerents, the human instruments by which his will was to be executed in the nation. The judges and kings of Israel were the "sons of God" in a preëminent sense,[1] the objects of Jehovah's special care and favor. It was natural that, where such ideas were current and powerful, the ideal of society should be conceived under the form of a kingdom or rule of God.

The influence of oppression on the idea.

Other circumstances contributed to the same result. The oppression which the Jewish people suffered at the hands of other nations, especially their experience under the Syrian and Roman dominations, tended to make the idea of a divine kingdom living and effective in Israel. When the Jews of Jesus' time spoke of the kingdom of God, they thought of a world-power which should throw off the hated yoke of the Roman oppression. Visions of this coming glorious day for Israel constitute the substance of the apocalyptic writings of the later Jewish period.[2] In the later prophecies this idea of the kingdom is predominant. "In the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor

[1] 2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2:7; 82:6, 7; 89:27.

[2] See article, "Apocalyptic Literature," by Charles, in Hastings' *B. D.*; Bousset, *op. cit.*; Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah, passim.*

shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."[1]

Popular Jewish ideas of the kingdom.

It is obvious, alike from the Old Testament, from the late Jewish writings, and from the New Testament, that the Jews conceived of the kingdom as an outward national organization — a world-empire having its centre in Jerusalem and having as its head the long-expected Messiah. Another current idea concerning the coming kingdom was that it was to be introduced by a startling catastrophe, a signal intervention of God in human history. The victorious Messiah should suddenly appear, beat down his enemies, and establish his throne in power and splendor. To this idea a literal interpretation of Old Testament prophecy, combined with the keen sense of the injustice of the persecutions which the people were suffering, powerfully contributed. The kingdom of the apocalyptic books is a world-empire, greater than Rome, to be suddenly and miraculously established.[2]

Jesus' view contrasted with the popular idea.

Jesus' view of the kingdom presents a sharp contrast to this popular idea. The nature of the kingdom as a spiritual society — as composed of those who possess certain qualities of mind and heart — is clearly indicated in Jesus' statements of the terms on which men may become members of it. All the conditions of participating in his kingdom which he describes are spiritual. The Beatitudes are the classic illustrations; those who are poor in spirit, the meek, the peacemakers, those who seek after righteousness, are the ones who are prepared for his kingdom, and to whom it is prom-

[1] Dan. 2 : 44.

[2] On the popular ideas of the Jews concerning the kingdom of God, see Ch. I. The subject is fully discussed by Baldensperger in Pt. I of his *Selbstbewusstsein Jesu.*

ised.[1] Not with observation, he said, would his kingdom come.[2] The kingdom is already present in the midst of you.[3] The condition for entering it is the possession of the child-spirit.[4] He will have the highest place in this spiritual empire who serves most.[5] He that humbleth himself to the life of sacrifice and helpfulness shall be most highly exalted in the kingdom of God.[6]

Reason for the disciples' disappointment.

In these characteristics of our Lord's teaching we readily discover the reason why his first disciples were perplexed and disappointed at his failure, as they thought, to inaugurate the Messianic reign. Between their conception of the nature and coming of the kingdom and the idea of Jesus the difference was deep and wide. They dreamed of places of honor and power in a world-empire.[7] They discussed the question who should be the greatest in the kingdom.[8] They thought, after the resurrection, that the establishment of the kingdom had been too long delayed, and eagerly asked: "Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"[9] Jesus had done few of the things which they expected to see done. He had made but a sparing use of miraculous power. He had furnished no startling demonstrations such as those who asked for signs[10] desired; he had thrown himself from no pinnacle and had fallen down to no world-power, as he had been tempted to do at the beginning of his ministry;[11] he had refused to give any sign except the Jonah-sign — the teaching of his heavenly truth.[12]

There was thus a distinctively new note in Jesus' teaching concerning his kingdom. It was new cloth

[1] Matt. 5: 3–12.
[2] Lk. 17: 20.
[3] Lk. 17: 21.
[4] Matt. 18: 3.
[5] Matt. 20: 26.
[6] Matt. 18: 4.
[7] Matt. 20: 20 ff.
[8] Matt. 18: 1.
[9] Acts 1: 6.
[10] 1 Cor. 1: 22.
[11] Matt. 4: 5, 9.
[12] Lk. 11: 29–32.

The note of newness in Jesus' doctrine of the kingdom.

and could not be stitched upon the old garment of Judaism; it was new wine and must not be put into old wine-skins.[1] There had, indeed, been a kingdom of God in the world before his coming, but it was rudimentary, limited, provisional, and national in form. In an important sense the kingdom of God came with his coming. Hence, at the beginning of his work, he announces its approach.[2] He proclaims the conditions on which men may enter it.[3] Not citizenship in the Jewish nation, not the performance of ceremonial rites, but the possession of certain states of mind, the fulfilment of certain moral conditions, entitles men to membership in his spiritual empire.

The note of universality.

Another characteristic of the kingdom, closely connected with the foregoing, is that it is universal. Being a moral and spiritual affair, it follows that it is for all men, irrespective of nationality or outward condition. It is, of course, true that Jesus came to the Jewish people and offered himself to them as their Messiah.[4] He always recognized the historic and economic connection of his work with the Jewish religion and nation. This thought is expressed in the saying, "The [Messianic] salvation is from the Jews."[5] The Jews were, therefore, the natural "sons of the kingdom"[6]; and yet, he told them that, unless they fulfilled the conditions in heart and life which were necessary to participation in his spiritual commonwealth, they should be "cast forth into the outer darkness,"[7] and added that the "kingdom should be taken away from them, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."[8]

The kingdom a growing affair.

Still another note of the kingdom is this: it is a growing affair. The kingdom is frequently likened to

[1] Mk. 2:21, 22.
[2] Mk. 1:15.
[3] Matt. 5:20.
[4] Matt. 15:24; Jn. 1:11.
[5] Jn. 4:22.
[6] Matt. 8:12.
[7] *Ibid.*
[8] Matt. 21:43.

something that is alive. It is like the mysteriously growing grain;[1] like the small mustard seed which develops at last into a great plant;[2] like the leaven spreading in meal, "until it was all leavened."[3] The law of the kingdom is, "First the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear."[4] Its coming is subject to the law of historic development. Israel's history had been a preparation for it; the Messiah's work on earth especially marked its establishment in its true meaning and distinctive nature; but it is to continue to come in the world through the increasing obedience of men to God until his saving purpose for mankind shall be realized. Alike in extension and in intention it is to go on developing in greater and greater power.[5]

What the kingdom is *not.*

We have followed Jesus' teaching concerning the kingdom far enough already to see that it is plainly distinguished from certain rival conceptions. It is neither synonymous with the Jewish theocracy, nor with the world-empire described in the apocalyptic books, nor with any specific church or group of churches. The conditions of membership and leadership in it are, in a great measure, different from those which the various churches of Christendom have prescribed. It is too large, too comprehensive, too spiritual a society to coincide with any actual variety of church. However greatly different churches, or the universal Church collectively considered, may aid the progress of the kingdom, it is more and greater than any visible, outward organization.

Disputed questions.

There are three questions which are frequently asked and energetically discussed among students of

[1] Mk. 4:26 ff.
[2] Matt. 13:31, 32.
[3] Matt. 13:33.
[4] Mk. 4:28.
[5] The parable of the Mustard Seed (Matt. 13:31, 32) illustrates the *extensive*, that of the Leaven (Matt. 13:33) the *intensive*, aspect of the kingdom's growth.

Jesus' teaching concerning the kingdom of God. They are: (1) Does "kingdom" mean reign, dominion, or does it mean the sphere within which God rules? (2) Does Jesus conceive the kingdom as already present, or as future? (3) Is the kingdom regarded as a heavenly gift to men or as a moral task to be achieved by them?[1]

Inward or outward.

It is certain that the kingdom is presented in the Gospels as something inward or spiritual. The classic passage expressive of this idea is: "And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you" (or in the midst of you).[2] Jesus is here contrasting his kingdom with the apocalyptic and catastrophic kingdom of popular expectation. Its coming is analogous to the silent processes of nature. The implication is that the sphere of its coming and manifestation is that of the inner spiritual life. Especially clear is this if the meaning of ἐντὸς ὑμῶν is: "within you."[1] The conditions of entrance into the kingdom are spiritual. The kingdom of God *is* within men, in the sense that its law is a law of the inner life; its principle is obedience to God.

A visible aspect also.

But it does not follow that the kingdom has no outward or visible aspect. In his work as Founder of the kingdom Jesus took steps to create a society which

[1] The Germans express this question by a play on words: Is the kingdom a *Gabe* or an *Aufgabe?*

[2] Lk. 17:20, 21.

[3] The meaning more commonly assigned to it by modern interpreters is, "in the midst of you," on the ground that Jesus was speaking to the Pharisees, in whom he could not say that his kingdom dwelt. But it is possible that "you" (ὑμῶν) might have been generically used.

should be the outward expression of the rule of God in the hearts and lives of men. No organized society — considering human imperfections — could correspond perfectly to the kingdom or fully express its nature. The kingdom will always remain more and greater than any and all Christian institutions. But the law of the kingdom is the law of expression; it will tend to embody itself in outward forms which it will use for its ends. These will be approximate realizations of its ideal in the varied social relationships and activities of human life. Primarily, the kingdom is the rule of God in human hearts and lives, but this more active and inward aspect of the kingdom implies the more outward aspect as its counterpart and result. Thus it is seen that the facts of life which Jesus covered by the phrase in question can be stated in a variety of forms. The kingdom may be called a society — a certain, though unknown, number of persons; or it may be regarded from the standpoint of its principles, its law. In that aspect we may properly speak of the rule or kingdom as *within* men and as synonymous with its "invisible laws."[1]

Present or future.

Did Jesus conceive his kingdom as already present in the world, or as a consummation to be realized in the future?[2] I should answer the question by saying that both aspects are emphasized in the teaching of

[1] So Sanday, Hastings' *B. D.*, II, 620. Cf. Rom. 14:17.

[2] Among those who regard the idea of the kingdom as predominantly an eschatological conception are: Meyer, Schmoller, Issel, J. Weiss, and Kaftan. Its presence here and now is maintained by Ritschl, Wendt, Bruce, Mathews (*Social Teaching*, p. 51), Orr (article, "Kingdom of God," in Hastings' *B. D.*), and Bousset (see especially *Jesu Predigt*, pp. 99, 100). Cf. my *Theology of the N. T.*, pp. 37–40, and the admirable remarks of Professor Peabody in *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, pp. 91–104, and the various opinions there cited.

Jesus.[1] The kingdom is declared to be at hand;[2] is said to have come to or upon those to whom Jesus spoke[3] and is represented as being within (or among) the people of his time.[4] Jesus compared the least member of the kingdom with John the Baptist,[5] exhorted men to seek his kingdom,[6] and spoke of persons who were entering it at the time.[7] Moreover, the parables of the Sower, the Tares, the Mustard Seed and the Leaven all assume that the kingdom is a present reality whose actual method of growth Jesus is illustrating by natural analogies.

The future coming of the kingdom.

But Jesus is also represented as speaking of the kingdom as future. Within the lifetime of the generation then living it will come in power.[8] There is no doubt that our Synoptic tradition associates the coming of the kingdom of God in a special manner with the "coming" or "parousia" of Christ which is described in the great eschatological discourse.[9] What the nature of that coming of Christ in his kingdom is we shall have to consider hereafter. It is enough to notice here that a *future* coming of the kingdom is recognized.

Reconciliation of the present and future aspects.

The difficulties which this twofold representation may seem to occasion are resolved by remembering that for Jesus the kingdom was a comprehensive idea. Its growth should be a great historic process, marked, however, by special epochs, such as his coming in his glory which some of his disciples should live to witness. The kingdom was both present and future. In its beginnings it was really present; the "blade" had appeared; but the development of the "ear" and

[1] Cf. Sanday, in Hastings' *B. D.*, II, 620.
[2] Matt. 9:1 (ἤγγικεν). [4] Lk. 17:21. [6] Matt. 6:33.
[3] Mk. 1:15. [5] Matt. 11:11.
[7] Matt. 20:31; 23:13.
[8] Mk. 9:1. Cf. 14:62; Matt. 26:64; Lk. 22:69.
[9] Mk. 13; Matt. 24; Lk. 21.

especially of "the full corn in the ear"[1] was yet future. The seed had been planted, the leaven deposited in the life of the world; the growth of the great tree, the leavening of the whole lump, would be the work of an indefinite period.

A gift or a task?

Is the kingdom a gift (*Gabe*) or a task (*Aufgabe*) — something to be received and enjoyed, or something to be done or achieved?[2] The question draws the lines too closely. I should say that the idea that the kingdom is a heavenly gift, a supernatural boon to men, is the predominant one.[3] But this does not exclude the element of human effort or achievement in the realization of the ends of the kingdom. God's kingdom comes in and through the doing, by men, of the will of God on earth.[4] Every gift of God imposes a task, and it is largely a question of words whether that comprehensive name for God's greatest boon[5] shall be called a gift or a task. It is both. Or, if one prefers, it is a gift whose appropriation and use constitute man's highest life-task.

Definitions of the "kingdom of God."

What, then, is the kingdom of God? How shall we define it? Jesus told us what it *is like* but he never defined it. Let me set down a few of the definitions which have been given by recent writers. Dr. Hort defined it as "the world of invisible laws by which God is ruling and blessing his creatures."[6] Professor

[1] Mk. 4:28; Matt. 13:32, 33.

[2] The former view has been emphasized by Schmoller, Lütgert, Bousset, J. Weiss, and Holtzmann (see his *Neutest. Theol.*, I, 202); the latter by Ritschl (*Unterricht*, § 5) and Issel (*Reich Gottes*, p. 67 ff.).

[3] The kingdom "comes" to men (Matt. 6:10; 10:7; Lk. 11:2, 20); is "given" and "received" by them (Matt. 21:43; Mk. 10:15); is "prepared" for men and "inherited" by them (Matt. 25:34); but it is also the object of search and striving (Matt. 6:33; 13:45).

[4] Matt. 6:10.

[5] Matt. 13:44–46.

[6] *Life and Letters*, II, 273.

Sanday approves this definition as the best one known to him[1]. Professor Bruce gave this definition: "The reign of divine love exercised by God in his grace over human hearts believing in his love, and constrained thereby to yield him grateful affection and devoted service."[2] According to Professor Wendt the characteristic note of the kingdom is "the idea of a divine dispensation under which God would bestow his full salvation upon a society of men, who, on their part, should fulfil his will in true righteousness."[3] Professor Mathews says, "By the kingdom of God Jesus meant an ideal (though progressively approximated) social order in which the relation of men to God is that of sons, and (therefore) to each other, that of brothers."[4] Dr. Horton gives a less formal definition. "The idea" (of the kingdom) he says, "is very simple but everything is involved in it. The sincere and practical recognition that God is sovereign; the complete inward acceptance of his sovereignty; the mode of life which results from this recognition and this acceptance, — that is the kingdom of heaven."[5]

Essential oneness of the definitions.

These definitions differ but little in their substance. They all express the idea that the kingdom of God comes in proportion as men love, obey, and serve God. For myself, I lay no stress upon the importance of a formal definition. I do not think it possible to do full justice to every aspect of so comprehensive a conception in a single brief formula. No form of words which we may frame can better express its meaning than does the paraphrase of the petition, "Thy kingdom come" in the Lord's Prayer, namely, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth."[6] The kingdom of

[1] Hastings' *B. D.*, II, 619.
[2] *Kingdom of God*, p. 46. [3] *Teaching of Jesus*, I, 175.
[4] *The Social Teaching of Jesus*, p. 54.
[5] *Teaching of Jesus*, p. 35. [6] Matt. 6 : 10.

God is the rule of God in human hearts and lives; it is so much of the world of human thought and action as makes the will of God its law.

The place of "the kingdom" in the teaching of Jesus.

If we must single out any one phrase or conception as best representing *the idea* of Jesus, we could not do better than to choose "the kingdom of God." But a certain onesidedness is quite likely to result from such a selection of a single category.[1] Jesus ran his thoughts into no single mould, but expressed them with the largest freedom, in a great variety of forms. His teaching had nothing of the stereotyped character which we observe in that of others. "The kingdom of God" was a convenient and expressive term which he transformed and elevated to his own uses; and, if it is comprehensively understood, there is no better symbol of the truth which he came to impart and of the work which he came to accomplish. To disseminate that truth, to perpetuate that work, is the task of his followers to the end of time.

[1] On this point see Orr, *The Christian View of God and the World*, pp. 401–412; Kidd, *Morality and Religion*, Lect. VIII; Drummond, *The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Christ*, pp. 179–186.

CHAPTER VI

THE FATHER IN HEAVEN[1]

Jesus' certainty of God's fatherhood.

JESUS' favorite designation for God was that of Father. He was accustomed to think and speak of him as his own Father[2] and to address him in prayer with such words as: "I thank thee, O Father,"[3] and "Abba, Father."[4] All his teaching concerning God proceeds upon the definite, unclouded certainty that God was his Father. "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father; and no one knoweth the Son save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him,"[5] — this is the best expression of the certainty and of the meaning of God's fatherhood in its relation to himself. When he spoke to men about God as the Father in heaven he spoke from an intimate knowledge, a clear inner certitude which sprang from his own perfect fellowship with God. He knew

[1] General References: *The New Testament Theologies* and the works of Bruce and Wendt, already cited; R. S. Candlish, *The Fatherhood of God*, 5th ed., 1870, advocating the view that God is the Father of believers only; T. J. Crawford, same title, 3d ed., 1878, a reply to the foregoing; C. M. Mead, in the *Am. Jour. of Theol.*, July, 1898 (defending limited conception of fatherhood); Stevens, *The Johannine Theology*, ch. iii, and the literature there cited; Sanday, article "God," in Hastings' *B. D.* (containing many references to technical treatises); Harnack, *Gott der Vater u. s. w.* in *Das Wesen des Christentums*, pp. 40–45.

[2] Matt. 10 : 32; 11 : 27; Lk. 22 : 29.

[3] Matt. 11 : 25. [4] Mk. 14 : 36. [5] Matt. 11 : 27.

himself as God's well-beloved Son, the special object of the Father's good pleasure,[1] and his life-work as occupation with the affairs of his Father.[2]

The doctrine of God's fatherhood central in the teaching of Jesus.

We shall have occasion to consider the significance for his own person of Jesus' consciousness of God's fatherhood when we come to discuss his sonship to God. It is sufficient here to point out how central is this conviction in the teaching of Jesus, and how it underlies all his assurances to men concerning the nature and character of God. He who told men that God was their Father himself knew him as his own Father. It was one who knew himself as God's Son who told men that they, too, might be sons of God.

Meaning of God's fatherhood as related to mankind.

What did Jesus mean by the words, "your Father who is in heaven"? "Fatherhood" is a figurative term derived from human relationships. What qualities does it cover and describe? What dispositions on the part of God, what attitude toward men, is it intended to emphasize? Jesus no more defined the term "Father" than he defined "the kingdom of God." We must gather his idea of fatherhood by inference from the various references which he made to the feeling, action, and requirements of the Father in heaven. A few characteristic examples of these references are as follows: "Let your light shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven."[3] "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be the sons of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust."[4] "Ye therefore shall be perfect [complete in love], as your heavenly Father is perfect."[5] On one occasion, after inculcating a lesson in humility, Jesus added: "For

Illustrations.

[1] Mk. 1:11. [3] Matt. 5:16. [5] Matt. 5:48.
[2] Lk. 2:49. [4] Matt. 5:44, 45.

one is your Father who is in heaven," and "he that is greatest among you shall be your servant";[1] and, at another time, after having taught his disciples to come to God with confidence in prayer, he added: "And whensoever ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any one; that your Father also who is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses."[2]

Contents of the term.

What, now, is the meaning of God's fatherhood which is involved in such expressions as these? I should answer that the idea of God's fatherhood embraces the four following elements: (1) It denotes the relation of kindred beings — the relation of a person to other persons. God is Father only in relation to men, who are kindred in nature to God, and capable of fellowship with him. *Your* Father (not *theirs*), said Jesus, feeds the birds.[3] (2) The fatherhood of God includes the idea of his special, providential care, "Your Father knoweth what things you have need of."[4] Jesus bases the doctrine of prayer in the paternity of God, and teaches men to pray, beginning, "Our Father."[5] (3) Fatherhood includes the divine compassion. The Father in heaven is the pitying, forgiving God. This is the outstanding characteristic of God's fatherhood as portrayed in the parable of the Prodigal Son. It is also implied in the teaching that men must be forgiving, if they expect God to forgive them.[6] (4) God's fatherhood means his universal benevolence. He is complete (τέλειος), not grudging and partial, in his love.[7] He loves and blesses all men, even "unjust" men. Those who will be like God, "sons" of the heavenly Father, must do likewise. To love only one's friends and favorites is to remain on the low level of heathen morality; if men will be imitators of

[1] Matt. 23 : 9, 11.
[2] Mk. 11 : 25.
[3] Matt. 6 : 26.
[4] Matt. 6 : 8, 32.
[5] Matt. 6 : 9.
[6] Matt. 6 : 14, 15.
[7] Matt. 5 : 48.

God, they must love all men, even their enemies, and desire and seek to do them good.[1]

Is God the Father of all men?

These considerations already involve the answer to the question, whether, in the teaching of Jesus, God is regarded as the Father of all men, or only of Christian believers. There is, indeed, no saying of Jesus which explicitly answers the question. The answer must be derived by inference from the nature of fatherhood as illustrated by Jesus, and from the general tenor of his teaching concerning God. I think there is no room for doubt that Jesus conceived of God as the Father of all men. In the parable of the Prodigal the father does not lose his paternal character or feeling because of the unfilial conduct of his lost son. The language of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount shows that fatherhood and love are synonymous terms as applied to God. His fatherhood is his creative, forgiving, all-embracing love, and must, therefore, be universal.

The fourth Gospel on the divine fatherhood.

The same view is borne out by the representations of Jesus' teaching in the fourth Gospel. There God is called (in relation to men)[2] "the Father" without qualification or restriction.[3] Nor is any valid objection to this view to be derived from the words, "If God were your Father," etc., and "Ye are of your father the devil,"[4] etc. The limitation of God's fatherhood in these expressions is rather apparent than real. When the passage as a whole is considered, it is seen that nothing is denied which is affirmed or implied in the Synoptic teaching, since the object of Jesus' words is not to define the nature of God, but to describe the character of certain men. It is an *argumentum ad hominem*, in rebuttal of their claim that they

Argument for the limited view of God's fatherhood.

[1] Matt. 5 : 44–46 ; Lk. 6 : 35.
[2] Cf. my *Theol. of the N. T.*, pp. 180, 181.
[3] Jn. 4 : 23 ; 15 : 16 ; 16 : 23.
[4] Jn. 8 : 42, 44.

are the sons of Abraham and of God. The purpose of the sayings in question is to emphasize how *unlike God*, in their spirit and action, the opponents of Jesus were. The import of the passage is: You are not true sons of God, as you claim to be, just as you are not true sons of Abraham; you are unlike both Abraham and God in character. The argument which would prove from these phrases that God was not the Father of the Pharisees would equally prove from the words, "If ye were Abraham's children,"[1] that the Pharisees were not descendants of Abraham.[2] If, however, one be disposed to insist on the form of words, "*If God were your Father*," all that could be inferred would be that fatherhood is here used as a name for the favor or approval (the complaisant love) of God. In the sense of approving all, God is not, of course, the Father of all men. In any case, when the content of the idea of fatherhood, as represented in the Synoptics, namely, as original, compassionate, universal love, is taken into account, it is certain that we find nothing inconsistent with this idea in the fourth Gospel. In this version of Jesus' teaching also God so loves as to love the world.[3]

A *reductio ad absurdum.*

It is obvious from what has been said that father-

[1] Jn. 8:39.

[2] Since these words constitute the rebuttal to the Pharisees' statement, "Our father is Abraham" (v. 39), they are equivalent to the affirmation, Your father is *not Abraham*. The parallelism between this phrase and the words, "If God were your Father" (v. 42), also establishes this equivalence. But that Abraham *is*, in a true and proper sense, their father is recognized in v. 37. The real meaning is: You are not true sons of Abraham; that is, you do not act as he did; you do not "do the works of Abraham" (v. 39). In like manner, in saying, The devil, and not God, is your father, the meaning is: You are like the devil, and not like God.

[3] Jn. 3:16; 8:12.

hood is more than creatorship. It denotes, primarily, ethical qualities and relations. It defines the character of God as revealed in Christ and manifested in his disposition and action toward men. If one were to use the technical terms of theology, he would say that fatherhood comprises, not the natural, but the moral, attributes of God.

Fatherhood more than creatorship.

This result furnishes the right point of view from which to answer the question, whether, if God is the Father of all men, all men are sons of God. If fatherhood meant mere creatorship, there could be no question respecting the answer. All men are God's creatures; they are the "offspring of God,"[1] and, in that sense, his sons. But since, in the teaching of Jesus, the stress in the conception of fatherhood lies upon the moral character and personal relations of God to men, the answer is not so evident. If the essence of fatherhood is love and if the essence of sonship is likeness to God, are all men sons of God? God is always the Father, and the Father of all, for he is always what he ought to be; he always corresponds to his idea; in him the ideal and the real are identical. But with men it is not so. They are, indeed, morally kindred to God, and, in that sense, sons of God. They are also ideally, that is, in the divine *idea* of humanity, sons of God, since man is made and designed for fellowship with God and likeness to God; but, in fact, men realize their idea but imperfectly; many by wilful sin repudiate their true filial relation to God and are "no more worthy to be called"[2] God's sons.

Are all men sons of God?

Accordingly we find that Jesus was not accustomed to speak of all men as sons of God. The man who refuses the life of love is not a son of God in the sense in which Jesus uses the term. Hence he spoke of the way in which, by acting in a Godlike manner, men "*become*

Men *become* sons of God

[1] Acts 17 : 29. [2] Lk. 15 : 19.

(γένησθε) the sons "[1] of God. The same usage is seen in the fourth Gospel. The Jews who refused him and despised his message are not sons of God, but of Satan.[2] Jesus' conception of sonship to God, as the moral counterpart of God's fatherhood, is very clearly reflected in the saying: "As many as *received him*, to *them* gave he the right to *become* (γενέσθαι) *children of God*, even to them that *believe on his name*."[3]

The ethical import of sonship.

The question of man's sonship to God is often discussed quite without reference to the specific usage of Jesus or without considering the nature of the correlation between fatherhood and sonship as he conceives them. Fatherhood is often taken in a mere natural sense, and the easy conclusion drawn that all men are sons of God. Or, the sonship of all men to God is deduced from the words of the model prayer, "Our Father," and from the fact that in the parable the prodigal is still regarded as a son. The answer to the first argument is that the phrase, "Our Father," is the beginning of a form of prayer which Jesus gave to his disciples, and to the second the answer is that it proceeds upon an allegorizing application of the idea of mere natural fatherhood. There is little occasion for doubt or difference of opinion respecting the meaning of Jesus in his teaching about fatherhood and sonship. There is a sense in which even the worst of men may be called sons of God; that is, they are designed for fellowship with God and by virtue of their moral nature are capable of obedience and love to him; but this is not the sense in which Jesus uses the term. He uses it as the moral counterpart of God's fatherhood, that is, completeness in love. Hence, in this characteristic usage of words, they only are sons of God who live the life of love in fellowship with God.

[1] Matt. 5:45. [2] Jn. 8:41–44. [3] Jn. 1:12.

Jesus' fulfilment of the Old Testament concept of God.

We can now see how in his teaching concerning God, as in regard to other subjects, Jesus fulfilled the law and the prophets. The Old Testament religion had attained a lofty, ethical monotheism in which strong emphasis was laid upon the unity and righteousness of God. Jesus recognized the great truths underlying this conception of God, and built upon them in his teaching. When asked, "What commandment is the first of all," he answered, beginning, "The first is, Hear, O Israel. The Lord our God, the Lord is one," etc.[1] As in the Old Testament,[2] so in the teaching of Jesus, God is the righteous King and Judge of men.[3] Nor were the qualities of God which fatherhood connotes wholly unrecognized in Israel. God is there described as a God of grace and pity,[4] and is occasionally called Father.[5] But the love and fatherly solicitude of God are commonly conceived as terminating upon Israel. God is regarded as the Father of the Jewish nation, or of their king;[6] his paternal relation to all men, though not wholly unrecognized,[7] is not the predominant idea in the Old Testament, nor did it ever become the practical, working theory of the Jewish people. "God is *our* Father"[8] was their motto; that is, we are the special objects of his love and favor. Against this proud and exclusive claim, on the part of the Jews, the Apostle Paul had frequent occasion to protest.

Jewish application of God's fatherhood.

[1] Mk. 12:28, 29. [2] *E.g.* Ps. 5:2; 24:10; 103:13.
[3] Matt. 5:35; 11:25; 18:23 ff.; 22:2 ff.
[4] Hos. 11:1; Is. 1:2. [5] Deut. 1:31; 8:5.
[6] 2 Sam. 7:14; Ps. 89:26, 27.
[7] Jer. 2:27; 3:4; Mal. 1:6. Of these passages Schultz says: "They refer to God solely as the great First Cause and the Supreme Ruler, so that nothing more is implied than in the term 'Lord.' Consequently, as a real divine name, this word does not take us beyond the ordinary Old Testament doctrine of God." — *O. T. Theol.* II, 138, 139. [8] Jn. 8:41.

P. J. LIBRARY K. C. K. BAPTIST SEMINARY

God's universal love.

Now, while Jesus recognized that the fatherhood of God has a deeper meaning and richer content for his faithful and obedient disciples than for others, because fatherhood denotes personal relations which, by their nature, are reciprocal, still, he never limited the fatherhood of God, after the manner of Jewish particularism. God's grace is boundless. He is as ready to bless and save Gentiles as Jews. Indeed, in the case of one Gentile, Jesus pronounced a favorable opinion which it would be difficult to match among all his recorded judgments of men. Speaking of the Roman centurion at Capernaum, he declared that in all Israel he had not found a disposition so pleasing to God as that of this heathen soldier.[1]

His readiness to forgive.

Jesus fulfilled the Old Testament conception of God by exalting the spirituality[2] and the universal love of God. This love is, at once, holy and benevolent. As it is both pure and pitying in itself, so does it require purity and pity in men.[3] The sons of God must be the "salt" and "light" of the world;[4] but they must also be ready to forgive men their offences, as the Father in heaven has shown himself ready to forgive them.[5] Christ frequently emphasized God's pity to the undeserving and outcast, and represented his own work as a mission to the lost.[6] His enemies called him a friend of publicans and sinners,[7] and they were right. He cared for those for whom nobody else

[1] Lk. 7 : 9.

[2] "Spirit is God," *πνεῦμα ὁ θεός*; Jn. 4 : 24.

[3] See the article "Righteousness," in Hastings' *B. D.*

[4] Matt. 5 : 3, 14.

[5] Matt. 6 : 13–15. Indeed, the forgiving spirit is made the precondition of the divine forgiveness. In the Lord's Prayer his disciples are taught to pray: "Forgive us our debts, *as we also have forgiven* (*ἀφήκαμεν*) our debtors" (Matt. 6 : 12).

[6] See, especially, Lk. 15.

[7] Matt. 11 : 19.

cared, and in so doing knew that he was doing the will and revealing the nature of him that sent him.

The revelation of God in the life of Jesus.

But it was not merely in Jesus' teaching that he emphasized the grace and fatherhood of God; he emphasized these truths by the whole spirit and work of his life. When Philip said unto him, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us," he answered: "Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father: how sayest thou, Show us the Father?"[1] What could Jesus mean by saying that to see him was to see the Father? Many passages show that he could not have intended to identify himself absolutely with the Father, denying all distinction between the Father and himself. He must have meant that in his own person and work the fatherliness of God was so revealed that one need not look elsewhere to obtain a knowledge of what God is. His life is the adequate revelation of God. He and the Father are one in nature, in spirit, and in working.[2] "My Father worketh hitherto," says Jesus, the Father has always been active in blessing and saving men, "and I work."[3] The life of Jesus is all in the line of the Father's unceasing beneficence, and is the historical interpretation and realization of it.

Jesus himself the revelation.

Jesus' doctrine of God is to be derived, therefore, not merely from what he said about God, but from what he did and was. He is himself the revelation of God, the interpretation of God to man. His life is the self-utterance of God in history. He is the true living Word of God, the image, the expression of Deity whereby we learn most of the nature and feelings toward us of the infinite and invisible God. He re-

[1] Jn. 14:8, 9. [2] Jn. 10:30.
[3] Jn. 5:17.

veals God's fatherly qualities by exhibiting toward men a more than human compassion and tenderness, and by himself living, in his relation to God, a perfectly filial life, thus showing man how to be certain of God's fatherhood by himself living as a son of God.

CHAPTER VII

THE SON OF MAN[1]

Use of "Son of man" in the Gospels.

THE title "the Son of man" occurs thirty-five times, excluding duplicates, in the Synoptic Gospels, and eleven times in the fourth Gospel. In the former it is uniformly a self-designation of Jesus; in John, also, it is practically such, unless we adopt the opinion of some that the passage, 3 : 13–15, purports to be the language of the author rather than that of Jesus. This view would make the transition at verse 13 very abrupt. In John 12 : 34, where the people ask, "Who is this Son of man?" they are but echoing Jesus' use of the term in the statement immediately preceding. Thus the fourth Gospel is seen to agree substantially with the Synoptics in representing "the Son of man" to be a title which Jesus applied to himself. About any independent use of it by others the Gospels are

[1] General References: Driver, article, "Son of Man," in Hastings' *B. D.*; Drummond, article, "Use and Meaning of the Phrase 'Son of Man' in the Synoptic Gospels," *Journal of Theological Studies*, April, July, 1901; Stalker, *The Christology of Jesus*, ch. ii; G. Alexander, *The Son of Man*; Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* (untranslated); R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, Appendix B, on the title "Son of Man"; J. V. Bartlet, in *The Expositor*, December, 1892; N. Schmidt, "Was Barnasha a Messianic Title?" in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. XV (1896); Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, Heft 6. The history of opinion respecting the meaning of the title is given in Appel's *Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu*, in Lietzmann's *Der Menschensohn* (both untranslated), and, more briefly, in Stevens' *The Theology of the N. T.*, pp. 46–52.

silent. The title does not occur in Paul's writings, and but once, elsewhere, in the New Testament.[1] The tracing of its history and the determination of its meaning are among the most difficult tasks of New Testament science.

Old Testament use of the term.

The term "son of man" occurs frequently in the Old Testament, and it is natural to seek some point of contact between its use as applied to Jesus and its meaning (or some one of its meanings) in the Old Testament. It occurs most frequently in Ezekiel as a name for the prophet, thus: "And he (the Lord) said unto me, Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak with thee. And the Spirit entered into me when he spake unto me, and set me upon my feet; and I heard him that spake unto me. And he said unto me, Son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel," etc.[2] Here the name means merely *man*, with a certain emphasis upon his weakness and dependence, in contrast to God. Elsewhere in the Old Testament the term is often used as a synonym for man, considered as a finite, mortal creature, as in Ps. 8: 4, where the parallelism shows that "the son of man" in the second line is equivalent to "man" in the first.[3]

"One like unto a Son of man" in Daniel.

A later Old Testament usage is found, or at least suggested, in the Book of Daniel. In chapter 7 a symbolic description of the world-kingdoms is given under the designation of "beasts." Then, in contrast to these brutal powers which are doomed to destruction, the seer beholds a kingdom emerging which shall have no end. "I saw in the night visions, and, be-

[1] Acts 7 : 56. In Revelation (1 : 13; 14 : 14) we have the Danielic form, "One like unto a son of man."

[2] Ezek. 2 : 1–3.

[3] "What is man that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man that thou visitest him?"
Cf. Job 25 : 6; Ps. 144 : 3; 146 : 3; Is. 51 : 12; 56 : 2.

hold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man," etc. "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."[1] This is a picture of the Messianic kingdom which, in contrast to the "beasts," is dignified by being compared to the noble human form. That by the "one like unto a son of man" is meant the nation of Israel, exalted and glorified, is evident from verse 27: "And the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High," etc. This passage, then, illustrates, in the earliest apocalyptic book of Judaism which is known to us, a mode of thought and speech which compared the Messianic kingdom to a son of man, that is, to a man, while other kingdoms were designated as "beasts." We do not yet hear the Messiah himself designated as "a son of man," much less as "the Son of man," nor do we even find him personally compared to a son of man. It is easy to see, however, how out of the comparison of his kingdom (conceived as a glorified Israel) to a son of man a usage might arise which should designate the Messiah himself as "the Son of man," particularly in apocalyptic books which were kindred to the Book of Daniel or influenced by it.

A designation for the Messianic kingdom.

To what extent this usage was actually developed (if developed at all) in pre-Christian times, is a difficult and disputed question. Certain it is that "the Son of man" became a Messianic designation, but whether it had already become such before Christ's coming we do not positively know. The steps of the

Development of the usage of "Son of man" for Messiah.

[1] Dan. 7:13, 14.

process probably were these: First, the "one like to a son of man" in Daniel was understood as a personal designation; it is so understood in the Similitudes of the Book of Enoch; then, in consequence of the application of the passage in question to the Messiah, the comparison would easily fall away and "the Son of man" would become a direct Messianic title. This usage also we see illustrated in the Book of Enoch, in which the Messiah is frequently designated as "the Son of man," with a view to emphasizing especially his majesty and glory.[1] If it were certain that those portions of this Jewish apocalyptic book called the Similitudes in which this usage is found, were pre-Christian,[2] then we should have an illustration of the currency in pre-Christian times of "the son of man" as a Messianic title, and could naturally account for Jesus' use of the designation. But the known facts do not carry us so far; they merely show us that (probably on the basis of the Danielic passage) the Messianic use of the term "the Son of man" was, in the course of time, developed.

Not in current use as a Messianic title in Jesus' age.

It is, of course, possible that a use of terms of which we have no certain examples in literature was, nevertheless, more or less current. We are warranted, however, in saying that "the Son of man" can hardly have been in common use as a Messianic title in Jesus' time; had that been the case, the fact must have left some clear trace of itself in the literature of pre-Christian Judaism. If it was in use as a name for the Messiah when Jesus came, its employment must have been limited and occasional.[3] Perhaps we may find in this fact a reason why Jesus preferred it as his own self-

[1] *E.g.* "For the Son of man has appeared and sits upon the throne of his glory," etc. (46 : 1).

[2] As Schürer, Charles, and others hold; *per contra*, Drummond, Stanton, Dalman, *et al.*

[3] Cf. my *Theol. of the N. T.*, pp. 41–48.

designation. The Gospels show us that he refrained from proclaiming his Messiahship; if "the Son of man" was not in general use in the sense of "the Messiah," it would, in this respect, perfectly serve his purpose.

Three uses of the term in the Synoptics.

When, now, we turn to the Synoptic Gospels and observe the passages in which the title occurs, we find that they fall into three classes, — two of them quite well defined, the third more indefinite. In one group of passages the title is associated with Jesus' sufferings and death; for example: "The Son of man must suffer many things";[1] "is delivered up into the hands of men";[2] "goeth [to death] even as it is written of him."[3] In a second group of passages the Son of man is depicted as coming again in power and glory to judgment: "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven";[4] "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory";[5] "and they shall see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory."[6]

(1) Humility and suffering.

(2) Majesty and glory.

Less definite passages belonging to these two groups.

If this first group of passages be taken as illustrating the general idea of lowliness and humiliation, and the second group as depicting power and majesty, then a number of passages which do not speak specifically of either may be associated with one or other of the groups. To the former would belong, for example, such sayings as this: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head"[7] — emphasizing the lowly poverty of the Son of man. To the same group would belong the saying that "the Son of man came

[1] Mk. 8:31.
[2] Mk. 9:11.
[3] Mk. 14:31.
[4] Matt. 24:31.
[5] Matt. 25:31.
[6] Mk. 13:26.
[7] Lk. 9:58; Matt. 8:20.

not to be ministered unto, but to minister," [1] and, perhaps, also the saying that blasphemy against the Son of man is less severely judged than blasphemy against the Holy Spirit of grace and truth which wrought in his beneficent ministry.[2] To the second group belong, in their general idea, certain expressions of the dignity, rights, and prerogative of the Son of man, such as, "The Son of man hath authority (*ἐξουσία*) on earth to forgive sins," [3] and, "The Son of man is lord even of the sabbath." [4]

(3) Relatively colorless passages.

A third and smaller group of texts represents a relatively colorless use of the designation "the Son of man." Examples are: "The Son of man came eating and drinking [that is, disdaining an ascetic life like that of John the Baptist], and they say, Behold a gluttonous man," [5] etc.; "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man"; [6] "For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost." [7] These passages depict important aspects of Christ's person and work, — his geniality, his communication of truth and life, his pity and solicitude for the sinful, — but they do not possess the characteristic note of either of the other two groups of passages, namely, humility and majesty.

Usage in the fourth Gospel.

If we turn to the fourth Gospel, we find there a twofold usage which corresponds, in general, to that which we have observed in the Synoptics. On the one hand, it was necessary that the Son of man be

[1] Mk. 10:45; Matt. 20:28.

[2] Matt. 12:32. Cf. Lk. 12:10. It is to be noted that Mark has, in the parallel passage, no reference to the Son of man, but the statement that all other blasphemies (except that against the Holy Spirit) "shall be forgiven unto *the sons of men*" (3:28).

[3] Mk. 2:10; Matt. 9:6; Lk. 5:24.

[4] Mk. 2:28; Matt. 12:8; Lk. 6:5.

[5] Matt. 11:19; Lk. 7:34.

[6] Matt. 13:37.

[7] Lk. 19:10.

lifted up on the cross;[1] on the other, the Son of man is to be exalted and to reign in power and glory,[2] has authority to execute judgment,[3] and bestows the gift of spiritual life upon men.[4] He is the One upon whom the angels of God, as in Jacob's dream, shall descend.[5] He is, moreover, the man who came down from heaven and who belongs to heaven as his native sphere.[6] In the one other New Testament passage where the title occurs,[7] it is associated with the heavenly glory of Christ. From the use of the term, then, outside the Synoptic Gospels, we gain the impression that the phrase was, at once, a designation of One who was destined to suffer and die and a title of majesty. As in the Synoptics, the Son of man must be despised, rejected, and put to death, but from this humiliation and death he will arise, ascend to heaven, be clothed with power and glory, and return to earth in majesty to judge the world.

Union of lowliness and dignity

In the light of the facts which we have reviewed, what meaning are we to attach to the phrase "the Son of man"? What aspect of Christ's person and work does it denote and emphasize? At least a score of answers have been given to this question. All the replies which are sufficiently influential to-day to warrant their consideration here may be grouped under four general types.

Theories as to the meaning of the title.

(1) "The Son of man" denotes the ideal, representative man, "to whom nothing human is foreign."[8]

(1) The ideal man.

(2) The title emphasizes, especially, Jesus' lowli-

[1] Jn. 3:14. Cf. 8:28; 12:34.
[2] Jn. 6:62; 12:23; 13:31.
[3] Jn. 5:27. [4] Jn. 6:27, 35. [5] Jn. 1:51.
[6] Jn. 3:13. It should be noted, however, that the phrase "who is in heaven," found in the Textus Receptus, is omitted by the best manuscripts. [7] Acts 7:56.
[8] So, *e.g.*, Neander, Baur, Reuss, Stanton.

(2) The lowly and suffering man.

ness, weakness, and liability to suffering and death.[1] Reference is made in defending this view to the Old Testament use of the phrase in the Prophets and Psalms as a name for man in contrast with God.

(3) Simply a man.

(3) The phrase means simply "man" or "a man," and, as Jesus used it, was not a title at all. In the Gospels it is a mechanical imitation of the Aramaic term *barnasha* ("a Son of man") which was the only expression in the Galilean vernacular for "man," and which had no other meaning.[2]

[1] So Nösgen, Wendt.

[2] A Dutch theologian, Uloth, broached this "Aramaic theory" in 1862. From linguistic considerations he reached essentially the same conclusion which had been held by Paulus and Strauss, that "Son of man" means simply a man, a weak, humble creature. In 1894 Eerdmans and Wellhausen espoused a similar view, the former arguing that "the Son of man," being the equivalent of the quite indefinite Aramaic *barnasha*, could not be a Messianic title; the latter, that it was a mistranslation of the Aramaic term due to the fact that the Hellenists did not understand that *barnasha* meant simply ὁ ἄνθρωπος. This view has been further elaborated, with variations, by N. Schmidt (*Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, Vol. XV, 1896), H. Lietzmann (*Der Menschensohn*, 1896), and Wellhausen (*Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 1899). The argument is now carried out to the point of asserting that Jesus never claimed to be the Messiah at all, and that all the passages in which "the Son of man" bears a Messianic meaning are to be rejected, and regarded as the product of the reflection of his disciples, who imported into his words a Messianic meaning. This conclusion is also defended, with other arguments, by Martineau (*The Seat of Authority in Religion*, 1891). The Messianic import of the title "the Son of man" for Jesus, is maintained, on linguistic grounds, by Dalman (*Die Worte Jesu*, 1898) and Gunkel (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.*, October, 1899). Gunkel contends that *barnasha* was an apocalyptic Messianic title, and that there is, therefore, no reason to assert that the Synoptic passages in which "the Son of man" bears a Messianic significance are foreign to the thoughts or to the original expressions of Jesus. Cf. Stalker, *The Christology of Jesus*, pp. 74, 75;

(4) "The Son of man" is a Messianic title, probably not widely current among the Jews in the time of Jesus, but just on that account the better adapted to the use of Jesus, who did not wish, at first, to proclaim his Messiahship. By it Jesus designates himself as the Head and Founder of the kingdom of God on earth.[1] (4) A Messianic title.

It is obvious that not all these theories are mutually exclusive. The first and second, for example, may be mere varieties of the fourth, on the supposition that the ideality of Jesus' manhood, or his lowly and suffering life, is the aspect of his Messiahship which the title especially emphasizes. The first of these views makes much of the passage in which Jesus says that because the sabbath was made for man, therefore the Son of man is lord of the sabbath.[2] The argument is: He who represents man's interests comprehends in his province the sabbath as a means to the ends of human well-being. The second view builds chiefly upon the first group of texts which we cited from the Synoptics. The objection to both these theories is that they cover but a portion of the facts. The "ideal man" theory, moreover, has a suspiciously modern look. The second explanation does not take sufficiently into account or furnish any explanation for the counterpart of the passages describing humility and suffering, namely, those which depict the dignity, glory, and dominion of the Son of man. Both these theories, while containing elements of truth, are too narrow to fit or to account for all the facts demanding explanation. Possible combinations of these theories. Objection to first two views.

Krop. "La Question du Fils de l'Homme," in his book, *La Pensée de Jésus sur le Royaume de Dieu*, 1897; J. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (2te Aufl., 1900), pp. 159–175.

[1] So, with variations on particular points, Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Baldensperger, Charles, Stalker.

[2] Mk. 2: 27, 28.

The "Aramaic theory" still in dispute.

The third theory is still under vigorous discussion, and the result of the controversy cannot be predicted. It involves the effort to determine of what term (if any) in the Aramaic language, which Jesus spoke, the Greek title ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ("the Son of man") was a translation, and what the force of that original Aramaic term was. In its latest phase the discussion involves the whole question of the Messiahship of Jesus, since several scholars have sought to prove that Jesus' Aramaic self-designation *barnasha* (Son of man) cannot be a Messianic title. Respecting this vexed and difficult question I must content myself with furnishing the reader the foregoing references to the literature of the subject and with adding the following remarks: —

Does not disprove that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah.

(1) Assuming that Jesus called himself *barnasha*, and that this term means only *man*, and is not a Messianic title, it would by no means follow that he was not and did not claim to be the Messiah. One finds the Messianic idea connected with Jesus everywhere throughout our Gospels. He is baptized, tempted, rides triumphantly into Jerusalem, suffers, dies, and rises as the Messiah. It is necessary to disprove, not merely the Messianic import of the Aramaic counterpart of the "Son of man," but the whole gospel picture of Jesus, if his consciousness of being the Messiah is to be disproved.

Apocalyptic basis for a Messianic usage.

(2) Since we know from Jewish apocalyptic usage[1] that the idea of "the One like unto a son of man"[2]

[1] Book of Enoch, 46; 2 Esdras 13 (also called 4 Esdras and Apocalypse of Esdras, or Ezra), where a vision of "the man" rising up out of the sea is described. In the explanation of the vision, "the man" is said to be the One through whom God will redeem his people. "The man" is also called God's "Son" in the same explanation.

[2] Dan. 7 : 13. Cf. Rev. 1 : 13; 14 : 14.

played a prominent rôle in the development of Messianic thought and language, it is highly probable that the term itself should furnish a designation for the Messiah. Nothing is more natural than to suppose that since the passage in Daniel was regarded by the Jews as referring to the Messiah personally, the phrase descriptive of him should have been shortened, and the Messiah himself spoken of as "the Son of man." We know that this usage existed in the first Christian century; it would require positive proof to the contrary to show that it might not have existed in Jesus' time. Such a Messianic designation could most easily arise in consequence of the Danielic passage.

"The man" might bear a Messianic sense.

(3) It is, therefore, far from proven that Jesus could not have expressed his Messianic consciousness and claim in his native language and even have used the word *barnasha* for the purpose. He might have meant by it *the man* whom the Jewish mind saw pictured in Daniel as taking to himself dominion and founding an imperishable kingdom.

The evidence of the Gospels not to be lightly set aside.

(4) The positive and abundant evidence of the Gospels to the effect that Jesus used "the Son of man" (or its equivalent) to designate an official peculiarity (to claim no more) of his person and work is not to be set aside by mere conjectures as to a supposed use of Aramaic words. That is to make the worse appear the better reason. All the New Testament representations agree in assigning to the title in question a special official significance; it requires much more than an argument from the silence of Paul and the citation of passages exhibiting the lexical meaning of *barnasha* to break the force of that fact.

The generally received view.

We venture then to adhere still to the view that the title "the Son of man" was a Messianic designation for Jesus himself, as it was for those who preserved

and shaped our Synoptic tradition. That this is its import on the face of the Gospels does not admit of reasonable doubt. The Messianic interpretation best accounts for all the facts. The various tasks, prerogatives, and experiences which are ascribed to the Son of man are all aspects or parts of the Messiah's character and work.[1] The fulfilling of the law as illustrated in declaring the true nature and use of the sabbath, the lowly endurance of poverty and suffering, and the final kingly triumph over the world, are all consonant with Jesus' conception of his Messianic experience and work. The theory in question harmonizes the apparently opposite representations in the Gospels. The Son of man is the lowly and suffering One who came to minister. It was essential in Jesus' conception of his Messianic calling that he should tread the path of humiliation and descend into the valley of death; but he was also sure that by the way of the cross he should come to his glory and his crown. In both he was fulfilling the will of the Father. The Messianic idea of the Jews of his time was surrounded only with associations of majesty and victory; he also saw a throne as the goal of his work, but it was the throne of One who should stoop to conquer, the greatness which is

Best accounts for all the facts to be explained.

[1] Speaking of the theory of Wellhausen and others, Harnack says: "Ich vermag dem aber nicht beizustimmen, ja ich finde, dass man unsere evangelischen Berichte aus den Angeln heben muss, um das Gewünschte zu erreichen. . . . Eine Geschichte wie die des Einzugs Christi in Jerusalem müsste man einfach streichen, um die These durchzuführen, er habe sich nicht für den verheissenen Messias gehalten und auch nicht dafür gelten wollen. Dazu kommt dass die Formen, in denen Jesus sein Selbstbewusstsein und seinen Beruf zum Ausdruck gebracht hat, ganz unverständlich werden, wenn sie nicht durch die messianische Idee bestimmt gewesen sind." — *Das Wesen des Christentums*, pp. 82, 83. Cf. Cone, *The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations*, pp. 96 *sq.*

the reward of service, the exaltation which is won by humility.

The root of the Messianic usage in Daniel.

It is probable that the title "Son of man" as a Messianic designation is derived from the Book of Daniel. The equivalence of the terms "Son of man" and "One like unto a son of man" in other Jewish apocalyptic books favors this supposition. The fact that Daniel was the great model of the apocalyptic writing and thinking which were so prevalent in Judaism during the last 150 years before Christ and on through the apostolic period lends strong probability to this conclusion. If this view is correct, then the term was, no doubt, one of the technical terms of Jewish apocalyptic. With this agrees its use in the apocalyptic Books of Enoch and Second Esdras. In the line of this usage, also, is the frequent employment of the term in our Gospels in connection with Christ's parousia — his return to earth on the clouds of heaven, in great power and glory, surrounded by myriads of angels. This was, indeed, its only original import, in the view of those scholars who think that Jesus' own idea of his kingdom was the current Jewish idea of a future world-empire to be suddenly inaugurated by some striking intervention of God. I have already sought to show that this, according to our sources, was not Jesus' idea of his kingdom. We have also seen that the apocalyptic associations of the term "Son of man" are not its only associations in the Gospels. The Son of man teaches, serves, suffers, and dies, as well as triumphs and reigns.

Conclusion.

The most reasonable conclusion is that Jesus' idea of his Messiahship was not narrow and single, but broad and many-sided, and that just as his idea of the kingdom included its present imperfect stages as well as its future greatness and victory, so the title "Son of man" comprehended for his mind the various tasks and

experiences of his life on earth which were to him the conditions of the victory which was to follow. No supposition is more misleading or more contrary to the evidence than the supposition that Jesus must have meant by the terms which he used just what the popular thought of the time meant by them. He is likely to mean more; he is certain to mean something higher. Indeed, what strikes one most in studying Jesus' teaching is the contrast between his meaning in the use of words and that which was common in his age.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SON OF GOD[1]

"Son of God" in the Old Testament.

THE term "son of God" meets us frequently on the pages of the Old Testament. It is natural, therefore, to seek some point of connection between this Jewish usage and the meaning of the title as applied to Jesus. In the Old Testament we find that angels,[2] magistrates,[3] individual Israelites,[4] the theocratic king,[5] and the nation as a whole,[6] are designated by this title. The general idea underlying this usage is clear. A "son of God" is one who is the special object of God's favor. As God's chosen people, the nation of Israel was God's "son" whom he had delivered from Egypt[7] and led and trained for a special mission in history.[8] In a preëminent sense is the king, as the head of the nation and a type of the Messiah, a "son of God." It is easy to see how the people who constituted the elect nation, and especially its representative men,

Its underlying idea.

[1] General References: Besides the *N. T. Theologies* and the works of Wendt (II, 124-136) and Bruce (ch. vii), already frequently cited, see the article "Son of God," in Hastings' *B. D.*; Stalker, *Christology of Jesus*, ch. iii; Stevens, *The Johannine Theology*, ch. ii; Harnack, "Das Evangelium und der Gottessohn," in *Das Wesen des Christentums*, pp. 79–92; Adamson, *The Mind in Christ*; Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, ch. x (a technical discussion of the title, with many references to the critical literature of the subject).

[2] Gen. 6 : 1–4.

[3] Ps. 82 : 6, 7; Ex. 22 : 28.

[4] Deut. 14 : 1, 2.

[5] 2 Sam. 7 : 14; Ps. 2 : 7; 89 : 27.

[6] Ex. 4 : 22; Deut. 22 : 6–10.

[7] Hos. 11 : 1.

[8] Deut. 1 : 31; 8 : 5.

should be regarded as uniquely loved and favored by Jehovah. Hence Paul summarizes the Old Testament representations of this love and favor in the assurance spoken by Jehovah to Israel: "I will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."[1]

In the later Jewish literature.

In the later Jewish apocryphal books "the Son of God" is employed as a synonym for the Messiah. The collocation "my Son, the Messiah" occurs in 2 Esdras 7:28, 29.[2] This distinctly Messianic use of the title is quite natural in view of the generic idea conveyed by the phrase in the Old Testament.[3] The Messiah, as the antitypical King of Israel, the Founder of the heavenly kingdom of God among men, the One whom God specially chooses, sends, and equips for his revealing and saving work, is preëminently God's Son. When we turn to the New Testament we find that these are precisely the ideas in which the Christian use of the phrase has its roots.[4]

Old Testament idea in the Synoptics.

There are two passages, common to all three Synoptists, in which the Old Testament idea is reproduced with some resemblance to the later apocalyptic usage, namely, the heavenly voices which spoke at Jesus'

[1] 2 Cor. 6:18.

[2] Cf. "my Son" in 2 Esdras 14:9, and in Enoch 105:2.

[3] Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 219–224, points out that the address of Jehovah to the Messianic king in Ps. 2:7, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," was the point of departure for the development of the Messianic use of the title "Son of God" (cf. Ps. 89:26). This passage, then, stands related to the New Testament use of "the Son of God" very much as Dan. 7:13 does to the use of "the Son of man."

[4] See Dalman, *op. cit.*, p. 221, and Charles, *Book of Enoch*, *ad. loc.*, 105:2. Second Esdras is, indeed, later than the time of Christ, and the relevant passages in the Book of Enoch are of uncertain date. But the passages quoted illustrate Jewish usage, and almost certainly reflect a Messianic application of the title "Son of God" in pre-Christian Judaism.

baptism and transfiguration: "Thou art my Son, the beloved, in thee I am well pleased."[1] "This is my Son, the beloved, hear ye him."[2] It is evident from these passages that "my Son" is synonymous with "my beloved," "my chosen One," that is, the Messiah considered as the special object of God's favor and the bearer of a special revelation from him to men.

Its use by the demoniacs.

In another group of passages Jesus is addressed by the demoniacs as the "Son of God" or "the Son of the Most High God."[3] Whatever vague or perverted notions these victims of possession associated with the title, it is obvious that it was a name for One of superior authority and power, and that, whether consciously used to denote the Messiah or not, it comprehended prerogatives which were a part of the Messianic vocation.[4]

In the narrative of the temptation.

The use of the term by those who were hostile to the purpose of Christ illustrates what differing aspects of his alleged Messiahship the term covered for those who employed it. In the narrative of the temptation Satan is introduced as the evil world-spirit in whom the gross and worldly tendencies of popular Jewish Messianism is embodied. Accordingly, he challenges Jesus to prove that he really is the Son of God by turning stones into bread.[5] The common expectation was that the Messiah should attest his claims by startling exhibitions of supernatural power.

Used by the high priest.

At the trial of Jesus, after the accusations had been made against him, the high priest bade him declare

[1] Matt. 3:17; Mk. 1:11; Lk. 3:22.

[2] Mk. 9:7. Luke (9:35) has: "my Son, my chosen"; Matthew (17:5): "my Son, the beloved, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him."

[3] Mk. 3:11; 5:7; Matt. 8:29; Lk. 8:28.

[4] See the summary of Messiah's works in Lk. 7:22 (Matt 11:5).

[5] Matt. 4:3; Lk. 4:3.

whether or not he was "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed,"[1] where it is evident that "the Christ" and "the Son of God" have essentially the same meaning. In like manner, he is challenged by his murderers to save himself from death and to come down from the cross, if he really is "the Christ of God,"[2] or, "the Son of God"[3]; and when he bowed his head and gave up his spirit,[4] the Roman centurion who stood among those who were watching Jesus exclaimed: "Truly this was God's Son,"[5] meaning that he was in some exceptional manner favored and sustained by God,[6] perhaps that he was some kind of hero or demigod.

Its use by Jesus' disciples.

Let us next observe the use of the title attributed to Jesus' own disciples. The classic passage under this head is Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi. Jesus asked his disciples, "Who do men say that I am?" and they quoted to him the various replies which they had heard. Then he asked them, "But who say ye that I am?" and Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ,"[7] or, according to Matthew, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."[8] With this saying may be compared the exclamation of the disciples after the walking upon the sea: "Of a truth thou art the Son of God."[9] If these uses of the title be regarded as amplifications by the first Evangelist,[10] they show, at any rate, how closely synonymous with Messiah the title in question was for the early Church. It emphasized the character of Jesus as the unique Messenger and Revealer of God.

[1] Mk. 14:61; Matt. 26:63.
[2] Lk. 23:35.
[3] Matt. 27:40.
[4] Lk. 19:30.
[5] Mk. 15:39; Matt. 27:54.
[6] Luke has the more general expression, "Certainly this was a righteous man" (23:47).
[7] Mk. 8:29.
[8] Matt. 16:16.
[9] Matt. 14:33.
[10] So Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 224, 225.

Jesus' own use of the title.

In but one place in the Synoptics[1] is the use of the full title "the Son of God" attributed to Jesus. At the crucifixion his murderers taunt him who, they say, called himself the Son of God, with his helplessness. From other passages, however, it is clear that Jesus accepted the title as applicable to himself. He is the "beloved son" of the parable of the Vineyard,[2] as he is the "King's son" for whom the marriage feast was made.[3] Still more direct is his claim to the title in the passages where he calls himself "the Son" in relation to "the Father,"[4] especially in the striking saying: "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him."[5]

Jesus' sonship distinguished from that of others.

Quite in accord with this passage we find that Jesus, in speaking of God to the people, or even to his own disciples, never uses the term "our Father," as if God were *his* Father and *theirs* in the same sense. He says, "my Father" and "your Father," but never "our Father." He knew himself as God's Son, and he recognized the sonship of other men to God, but these two sonships are never placed on an equality. The inference is inevitable that he knew himself as God's Son in some unique sense. Other men *become* sons of God; he *is* the Son of God without qualification or condition.

Use of the term in the fourth Gospel.

These facts pave the way easily and naturally to the usage of the fourth Gospel. There Jesus is compared to an only begotten son of a Father[6] and is

[1] Matt. 27 : 43. [2] Mk. 12 . 6; Lk. 20 : 13; Matt. 21 : 37.
[3] Matt. 22 : 2. [4] Mk. 13 : 32; Matt. 24 : 36.
[5] Matt. 11 : 27; Lk. 10 · 22.
[6] Jn. 1 : 14, ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός.

directly called the only begotten Son of God.[1] The term "only begotten" is, as the comparison just noted shows, a figure of speech drawn from human relations in order to emphasize the peculiar closeness and uniqueness of Jesus' relation to God. He is to God what an only son is to a father — one uniquely loved and sustaining relations of peculiar intimacy and union.[2] More than thirty times in this Gospel is Jesus designated as "the Son of God" or "the Son" in such a way as to accentuate his special relation to the Father and his special commission from God as the Bearer of life to the world.

Illustrations.

Characteristic statements of the mission and prerogatives of "the Son" are seen in such passages as these: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world; but that the world should be saved through him. He that believeth on him is not judged: he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God."[3] "Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing: for what things soever he doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner. For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doeth: and greater works than these will he shew him, that ye may marvel. For as the Father raiseth the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son also quickeneth whom he will. For neither doth the Father judge any man, but he hath given all

[1] Jn. 1:18; 3:16, 18.

[2] Cf. Dalman, *op. cit.*, who says that ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός and ὁ υἱὸς ὁ μονογενής have the same meaning.

[3] Jn. 3:16–18.

judgement unto the Son; that all may honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father who sent him."[1] "I and the Father are one."[2] "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me."[3] It is clear that the Son is here described as the Saviour, the Vicegerent of God, and the Executor alike of his gracious will and of his judicial purpose toward mankind. He so represents the Father, so reveals the Father's will and nature, that in him men see God disclosed to them,[4] and their treatment of him is the test of their attitude toward God.[5]

The Son represents God to men.

If, now, we glance back over the facts which have been adduced, and try to grasp their meaning for the person and claims of Jesus, we shall see that the term under discussion has a clear point of connection with the Old Testament usage which designated as sons of God those who stood in specially close relations with God, or were the objects of his peculiar love and favor. As such the title appropriately designates Jesus in his character as the Messiah, the Messenger of the covenant to Israel. The Messiah is by preëminence "the Son of God." But as the Jewish category of Messiahship could never contain Jesus' whole conception of his own person and work, so "the Son of God" could not have been conterminous in his mind with "the Messiah." Terms which are synonymous are seldom, if ever, identical in meaning and content. Both the Synoptic and the Johannine reports of Jesus' teaching require us to suppose that the sonship to God which he claimed was not so much an official as a personal relation. To the mind of Jesus his sonship designated,

Résumé of the usage in the Gospels.

[1] Jn. 5: 19–23. [2] Jn. 10: 30.
[3] Jn. 14: 11. Cf. 10: 38.
[4] Jn. 14: 9, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."
[5] Jn. 15: 23, "He that hateth me hateth my Father also."

not primarily a historic function, but an intimate fellowship and union with God. This unique reciprocal knowledge between himself and the Father, and the inscrutable union upon which it was founded, was, for the consciousness of Jesus, the basis and condition precedent of his historic mission. Jesus was the Messiah because he was *par éminence* the Son of God.

Traces of narrower and lower views of Christ's Sonship.

Certain passages in our Synoptic tradition illustrate a tendency on the part of the early Christians to limit the notion of Jesus' sonship to his Messiahship,[1] or to make it a name for the Worker of wonders,[2] or to associate with it the idea of a supernatural generation.[3] Such applications of the idea were certainly most natural, but the Synoptics themselves, no less than the fourth Gospel, furnish us the data for transcending them. No such conceptions were primary in Jesus' own consciousness of his sonship to God. The Godward relation which he sustained, — his unique union with God which enabled him to be the Revealer of God and the Saviour of men. — this it was which constituted Jesus' sonship to God.

Jesus' doctrine of his Sonship distinguished from that of theological speculation.

Such considerations as the foregoing bring us to the borders of the problem of the person of Christ beyond which our present purpose does not require us to pursue the subject. One thing is clear: it was not the purpose of Jesus to furnish the materials for a speculative theory of his person. He required of those who

[1] *E.g.* Matt. 2:15; 16:16. [2] Matt. 11:2 *sq.*

[3] Lk. 1:35. Dalman, *op. cit.*, 236, 237, distinguishes the Synoptists' and Jesus' idea of his sonship to God thus: They, being Hellenists, associated with it the idea "born from God," while for Jesus it denoted his present personal relation to God. He concludes: "Their method of thought is Greek; his is Semitic." The distinction is interesting, and has a certain basis in fact; but it would be quite unwarranted to represent the Synoptic Gospels as unaware of other and higher aspects of Jesus' sonship to God.

loved him, not the framing of a doctrine, but the keeping of his commandments, the doing of the will of his heavenly Father. His great claim was that he was sent of God on a supreme mission of revelation and salvation to mankind. He came to teach men the way of God in truth by illustrating alike in doctrine and in life what are the true ideals and ends of human existence. He further recognized his dependence upon his Father, whose will he had come to do. To him he prayed, and to his holy purpose and providence he freely subordinated himself.

The paradox of Jesus' person and work.

This is one side of the picture of Jesus which is presented to us in the Gospels — the lowly Son of man, praying, obeying, dependent, suffering. On the other hand, he assumes exemption from sin, speaks with a divine authority, freely revises the sacred law of Israel, claims the prerogative of judgment, and predicts his victory over the world. Did ever any character in history present so paradoxical an appearance? Is it any wonder that his person has been the problem of the ages? Here is a mystery which the researches and speculations of centuries have been unable to resolve. It is a familiar maxim that the greatest truths have always something paradoxical in them; the same holds true of the greatest personality.

The beginnings of speculative Christology

The Church early began to reflect upon the problem to which the life of the Master gave rise. The apostles and their associates offered no solution of it in the sense in which modern speculative thought attempts solutions of metaphysical problems; they rather expressed their convictions concerning certain assumptions which the facts known to them required. They knew that Jesus Christ was a true man, but they were sure that God had dwelt and wrought in and through him in a wholly exceptional manner. To the mind of the Church of the first age God was in Christ as in no

other; he was God manifest in the flesh, the reason, mind, and love of God revealed and interpreted in terms of human life and experience. The first Christian thinkers searched the vocabulary of their age for terms in which to express their sense of the unique significance, the incomparable value, of Christ. They called him the image or impress of God,[1] the first-born or only begotten Son of God,[2] the outshining of the divine majesty,[3] the Word, the self-expression, the uttered Reason of God.[4] They called him, after the manner of the sapiential books of Judaism, the eternal Wisdom of God, through whose coöperation God had formed the worlds.[5] By such terms as these, which were the current coin of the Jewish and Alexandrian thought-worlds of the period, did the early Christian teachers express the results of their reflections and experiences in the school of Christ. The roots of his being were in God. He was the divine-human personality. He was at once the interpretation of God to man and of man to himself. In him the nature, will, and world-purpose of God stood revealed. He was the truth of God's mind and feeling. In him men saw the Father. He was God's self-expression — the translation of God into terms of humanity.[6]

Terms descriptive of Christ.

[1] Col. 1 : 15; Heb. 1 : 3.
[2] Col. 1 : 15; Jn. 1 : 18.
[3] Heb. 1 : 3.
[4] Jn. 1 : 1, 14.
[5] 1 Cor. 1 : 24; Heb. 1 : 2; Col. 1 : 16; Jn. 1 : 3.
[6] "Nur von einem wissen wir, dass die, die mit ihm gegessen und getrunken haben, ihn nicht nur als ihren Lehrer, Propheten und König gepriesen haben, sondern als den Fürsten des Lebens, als den Erlöser und Weltrichter, als die lebendige Kraft ihres Daseins, — nicht Ich lebe, sondern Christus lebet in mir, — und dass bald mit ihnen ein Chor von Juden und Heiden, von Weisen und Thoren bekannt hat, aus der Fülle dieses einen Mannes Gnade um Gnade zu nehmen. Diese Thatsache, die am hellen Tage liegt, ist einzigartig in der Geschichte, und sie verlangt, dass das Factum der Person, die hinter ihr liegt, als

The aim of the New Testament Christology

The men who have left us these expressions of their faith on the pages of the New Testament did not present them as definitions of the interior mystery of Deity or descriptions of the constitution of Christ's person. They were voicing a living religious conviction, expressing in terms of their own age what Christ meant to them. They were registering their own experience of his revealing, saving power. In the glorious mystery of his life and death they found all the treasures of spiritual wisdom and knowledge, but they were "hidden" treasures,[1] which could never become accessible, as Pascal says, to mere "curious intellect," but only "to the eyes of the heart and the eyes which see wisdom."[2]

Its sufficiency for expressing the religious significance of Christ.

At the end of all our speculation, on the summit of all our theological theorizing, we can do no better than to adopt the language of the early Church and to confess Christ as the Son of God, the revealed Word, the brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person, the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God.

ein einzigartiges respektiert wird." — HARNACK, *Das Christentum und die Geschichte*, p. 10.

[1] Col. 2 : 3. [2] *Thoughts*, XIX, 1.

CHAPTER IX

THE VALUE AND DESTINY OF MAN[1]

Jesus' estimate of the value of man.

"WHAT shall it profit a man, to gain the whole world, and lose his own soul," or, as Luke has it, "his own self?" "Or, what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"[2] What price would be adequate, when once the soul is lost, to buy it back? These are the words which best reflect Jesus' estimate of the worth of man. His true life is a treasure beyond all price. It cannot be measured by material values; it cannot be bought or balanced by the worth of the whole world.

Even of the humblest.

Jesus sets this high value upon man as such. Even the humblest and most insignificant person possesses an infinite worth. The "little ones" of earth are not to be despised.[3] Whatever injures man in his moral life, causing him to stumble and fall, is condemned, however it may be sanctioned by tradition and custom. When the sabbath, for example, or any other religious institution, is so used as to come into conflict with man's true interests and thus to become a hindrance rather than a help to his moral life, it is then more honored in the profanation than in the observance.

[1] General References: Mathews, *The Social Teaching of Jesus*, ch. ii; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*; Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 40–45; Wendt, *The Teaching of Jesus*, I, 256–364; Stevens, *The Theology of the N. T.*, Part I, ch. viii; Bruce, *The Kingdom of God*, ch. v.

[2] Mk. 8:36, 37; Matt. 16:26; Lk. 9:25.

[3] Mk. 9:42.

The good of man is the end for which all religious ordinances exist; when they cease to serve that end, their value is lost.

The solicitude of God for his welfare.

Jesus strikingly expressed his sense of the value of man by the rhetorical figure of understatement, thus: "Ye are of more value than many sparrows";[1] "How much, then, is a man of more value than a sheep!"[2] The tender solicitude of God for the individual is expressed in the assurance, "The very hairs of your head are all numbered."[3] Whatever harms the soul, that is, vitiates and depraves the moral life, must be sacrificed. One should undergo the severest loss and suffering rather than forfeit his true life of fellowship with God and likeness to him. It were better to lose hands and feet than to go into Gehenna;[4] better to sacrifice all earthly possessions and comforts than to be hindered by these from realizing the true life of a son of God.[5]

Jesus' horror of sin.

These expressions also show with what horror Jesus contemplated sin. His sense of man's infinite worth supplied the measure by which he estimated whatever debased and ruined man. None ever saw and portrayed the exceeding sinfulness of sin as Jesus did. Hence his teaching that one might better suffer any possible loss rather than that loss of soul which is the consequence of sin. His pure eye clearly saw into the nature of sin as a perversion of the moral life, a wrong choice and preference, a corruption of the will and of the affections. It is the loss of the single eye, the clear vision; it is moral confusion by which the light within has been turned into darkness;[6] it is the folly, the absurdity, of trying to realize the true good and the true joy of

[1] Matt. 10 : 31.
[2] Matt. 12 : 12.
[3] Matt. 10 : 30.
[4] Mk. 9 : 43.
[5] Matt. 6 : 25; Lk. 12 : 15–21.
[6] Matt. 6 : 22, 24.

P. J. LIBRARY K. C. K. BAPTIST SEMINARY

life on the path of selfishness instead of under the law of love.

Sin has its seat in the heart.

Hence sin does not consist in outward acts as such, but in a state of the heart. Hate is the essence of murder; impurity of thought, the essence of adultery.[1] An evil heart is the fountain out of which evil acts and passions proceed. "From within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornication, theft, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness; all these proceed from within, and defile the man."[2] Hence a man is corrupt or pure in proportion as his inner life is corrupt or pure. The acts and words of men are determined by their characters, as the fruit of a tree is determined by the quality of the tree.[3] Hence the solemn significance which Jesus attached to the words of men: "By thy words shalt thou be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned."[4] The words of men are the test of them, since "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."[5] Words and actions are the forms in which the inner life of motive and principle expresses itself. It is because they are an index of the real inner man — the hidden man of the heart whom God alone sees — that they become the basis of the divine judgment of men. In the last analysis, however, sin and goodness lie, not in outward actions, but in inner dispositions; nothing is truly good which is not rooted in a good will, nothing evil which does not spring from an evil will.

Moral significance of one's "words."

Yet Jesus a friend of sinners.

But Jesus' searching analysis and severe reprobation of sin did not involve the hopeless abandonment of the sinner. Indeed, Jesus was surprisingly optimistic in regard to the moral possibilities of wicked men.

[1] Matt. 5 : 21, 22; 27 : 28.
[2] Mk. 7 : 20–23.
[3] Matt. 7 : 17–20.
[4] Matt. 12 : 37.
[5] Matt. 12 : 34.

His optimism seemed to the people of his time to amount to leniency in the estimate of sin, if not to positive approval. Hence they gave him the title, "Friend of publicans and sinners."[1] The difference between him and them was that he combined the severest disapproval of sin with love and hope for the sinner, whereas they could not separate the sinner from his sinfulness. The reason for this difference was that his sense of sin was clear and keen, while theirs was dull and confused. Seeing sin as consisting in perverse dispositions and affections, he saw that it could be cured by arousing in men new interests and by drawing out their life in a new direction. The religious authorities of Jesus' time, the moral censors of society, on the contrary, looked upon sin as a habit or mode of outward life, especially as characterizing certain occupations. Sin was to them a technical affair. Its chief consequence was loss of caste, social ostracism. In this view there was no hope for "sinners."[2]

Jesus' estimate of sin and sinners distinguished from that of the Jews.

It was the difference between a profound view and a superficial view of man, with a corresponding difference in the estimate both of sin and of goodness. Jesus saw the man beneath his sin; they saw only the man in his sin. The different view of sin was rooted in a different view of goodness. To the Pharisee virtue, like religion, was primarily a technical affair. It consisted in the punctilious doing of certain things — the minute observance of ritual, the scrupulous maintenance of ceremonial purity, and

The basis of this difference.

[1] Matt. 11 : 19.

[2] It is not denied that there were among the Jews those who took profounder views of sin and of morality. I speak here of the average attitude of the people, as illustrated in their moral conflicts with Jesus and reflected in the narratives of the Gospels.

the like. To the Pharisee to pray statedly in the temple was an act of religion; to Jesus it depended wholly upon the spirit of the prayer offered whether it was an act of piety or of impiety.[1] To the Pharisee it was a work of merit to stop in the busy street to pray, if the hour of prayer chanced to overtake him there; to Jesus it was a mockery to do so if the motive were to parade one's piety before men.[2] To the Pharisee it was a religious duty statedly to offer a sacrifice in the temple; Jesus declared that if on the way thither one remembered that he had wronged a brother, it was his duty to leave his gift to God unoffered and to go and right the wrong.[3]

The outer act and the motive.

From such differences with respect to what was good arose the difference between Jesus and his contemporaries in their estimates of sin. In the view of the pious people of his age it was a sin to touch a Samaritan in the street; in the view of Jesus it was a sin of the deepest dye *not* to touch him if he was in need of help.[4] In their view it was a sin, in any circumstances, to pluck ears of grain on the sabbath; in his view it was wrong *not* to do so when by such an act the real necessities of man and the requirements of his duty could be met.[5] In their view a sinful woman ought to be stoned to death; in his, she ought to be rescued by kindness to a virtuous life.[6]

Nowhere does Jesus' view of sin come to more pow-

[1] Lk. 18 : 10–13.
[2] Matt. 6 : 2.
[3] Matt. 5 : 23, 24.
[4] Lk. 10 : 30–37.
[5] Mk. 2 : 23–28.
[6] Jn. 8 : 1–11. This narrative, in spite of the weighty evidence against its being a genuine part of the fourth Gospel, has all the marks of originality and truth. It is probably a genuine narrative, which was preserved in some independent manner, and which at a comparatively late date was incorporated into the fourth Gospel. On the question, see the critical commentaries.

erful expression than in the incident just referred to. With what startling incisiveness did he disarm their unsparing condemnation, and disperse the accusers by calling upon any one of them who dared to say that he was guiltless of unchaste thought or passion to cast the first stone. By as much as his sense of the evil of sin was keener than theirs, by so much was his pity and his hopefulness for the sinner greater. Indeed, as between the sinfulness of the poor woman, doubtless the victim of circumstance and temptation, and that of her hard and pitiless accusers, whose tests of good and evil were wholly outward and superficial, Jesus clearly implied that the latter was more heinous. This is a reversal of common human judgment; it is Jesus' clear, unhesitating protest against the eternal Pharisaism of the human heart.[1]

Significance of the *pericope adulterae.*

If, now, we raise the larger question: What was Jesus' view of human nature in general? we shall find that he was not accustomed to pronounce sweeping judgments. He did not describe or treat human nature in the lump. Neither did he divide men into two sharply defined classes, good and bad. This method of classifying men was common in his time. There were two kinds of people, sinners and righteous persons. Jesus used the classification, but did not adopt it. He used the terms as we should do if we wrote them with quotation marks. The righteous in his time were the so-called "righteous," and the sinners were "the sinners" technically so-called. Of course, they were really, often grossly, sinful; but the technically "righteous" were often marked by quali-

Jesus refrained from sweeping judgments upon human nature in general.

[1] "He had refused to judge a woman, but he had judged a whole crowd. He had awakened the slumbering conscience in many hardened hearts, given them a new delicacy, a new ideal, a new view and reading of the Mosaic law." — *Ecce Homo* (8th ed.), pp. 98, 99.

ties which constitute the very refinements of sin, such as pride and hardness of heart. In fact, Jesus found a readier response to his truth among the "sinners" than among the "righteous." If susceptibility to his appeal were made the test of goodness, the two classes would often change places, and the sinners would be found entering the kingdom while the orthodox and pious of the time would be left out.[1]

His freedom from class prejudice.

But it would be an entire mistake to suppose that Jesus became the patron or apologist of the unpopular and despised classes as such. He defended no class, as against other classes. He was a friend of publicans and sinners, not because publicans pursued an unpopular calling or because "sinners" were social outcasts, but because he was a friend and helper of the needy and the erring whatever their status in society or their calling in life. He was equally a friend of scribes and Pharisees, or would have been such if they would have had him for a friend. Publicans were not worth more in his sight than Pharisees. But they were (at least sometimes) more conscious of their spiritual poverty and need[2] than Pharisees who belonged to the ranks of the self-satisfied who were but feebly aware, if aware at all, that they needed any repentance, and whose dominant note was always, "I am holier than thou."[3]

Recognized a mixture of good and evil in men.

These circumstances illustrate the fact that Jesus did not recognize the prevalent methods of distinguishing men into good and bad. Nor did he substitute for these any other method of so distinguishing them in a sweeping, unqualified manner. He recognized a mixture of good and evil in men. They were neither wholly good, nor wholly bad. Some scribes and Pharisees, for example, were not far from the

[1] Matt. 21 : 31. [2] Cf. Lk. 19 : 1–10.
[3] Cf. Lk. 18 : 11, 12.

kingdom of God;[1] against others Jesus spoke the sternest words of condemnation which ever passed his lips.[2] Many publicans were doubtless as sinful as the whole class of tax-gatherers were reputed to be; but Jesus found an apostle among them.[3] The difference between the popular judgment, with respect to such persons, and the estimate of Jesus was this: the people branded them as "sinners" chiefly because of their occupation and their social standing, while Jesus judged them by purely moral tests; they condemned them wholesale, as belonging to a reprobate class, while he judged every man on his merits, and refused to regard or treat him as either better or worse than he was.

Jesus did not teach "total depravity."

The teaching of Jesus lends no support to the doctrine of total depravity. All men are not as bad as they can be. There can be no greater contrast than that between the teaching, so long common in theology, that in consequence of original sin and native depravity all men are utterly destitute of all goodness and wholly inclined to all evil, and the attitude which Jesus assumed toward men. In even the worst of men he found a spark of goodness. He never regarded the lost as irrecoverable. He sought disciples among those who were popularly regarded as most unpromising, and often found them. Zacchæus proved himself a son of Abraham.[4] The publican who knew himself as a great sinner went down to his house justified.[5] The prodigal in his misery and rags had, at least, a yearning for his father's house and his father's love. He saw in the plain, common people the promise of a rich spiritual harvest, if laborers could be had to reap it.[6] How absolutely inconsistent is all this with the idea that

[1] Mk. 12 : 34.
[2] Lk. 11 : 42 *sq.*
[3] Mk. 2 : 14.
[4] Lk. 19 : 9.
[5] Lk. 18 : 14.
[6] Matt. 9 : 37, 38.

all men are, and have been from their birth, morally dead and incapable of any right desires, high aspirations, or noble efforts. The contrary was the conviction of Jesus, and the presupposition of all his work.

Sin against the Holy Spirit.

The nearest approach to an expression of hopelessness which we find among the sayings of Jesus is found in what he said of a sin against the Holy Spirit.[1] Some had ascribed his beneficent works to a diabolical source, thus illustrating the moral perversion of those who call evil good and good evil. They were headed toward that depth of depravity which Milton depicts when he represents Satan as saying, "Evil, be thou my good." Jesus solemnly warns them that the fearful thing in such an attitude of mind is not opposition to him or repudiation of his Messiahship, but contempt of the spirit of pure goodness which wrought in his benevolent ministry. But he does not say that the men to whom he spoke had actually reached the depth of perverseness to which their words pointed. It could scarcely have availed anything to warn them if they had reached the point of an absolute identification of their wills with evil. But Jesus points out the chasm which yawns before them. From other sins recovery is relatively easy, but when the sense of goodness is lost, on what shall recovery be based? Such a condition is not *a* sin; it is *sin* absolutely; it is "eternal sin."

His treatment of children.

The most revealing fact in regard to Jesus' attitude toward "human nature" is his treatment of children. When with indignation he rebuked the disciples for preventing the coming of children to him, he added, "Of such is the kingdom of God,"[2] that is, of such persons as little children are, the kingdom of God is composed. "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom

[1] Mk. 3:22–30; Matt. 12:22–45; Lk. 11:14–23.
[2] Mk. 10:14.

of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein."[1] Although it is not the object of these expressions to teach anything directly about human nature as illustrated in children, it is clear that Jesus could not have used the characteristics of children to illustrate the qualities required in members of the kingdom if he had regarded all men as "opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually."[2] He implied that there was natural goodness in children. In what it consisted he did not say, but we may legitimately infer from the use which he made of it that he was thinking, especially, of the spirit of trustful dependence and receptiveness in children which is so closely akin to religious faith. Inseparable from this sense of dependence is a certain humility and innocence of disposition which Jesus recognized when he took a little child and set him in the midst of his disciples, and said, "Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me."[3]

The basis of man's immortality.

That there is a future life for man is assumed in the teaching of Jesus. He had less occasion to dwell especially upon this truth, since belief in it was general in his time. The Sadducees, indeed, rejected it, and thrust their denial upon his attention by asking him, if a woman be seven times married, to which husband shall she belong in the resurrection life.[4] The chief point of interest in Jesus' rejoinder is that he grounds the hope of the life to come upon man's kinship to God. He lifts the whole subject to the highest plane, and finds the warrant of man's continued life in the boundless resources of the divine

[1] Mk. 10:15; Lk. 18:17.
[2] *The Larger Westminster Catechism*, Question 25.
[3] Mk. 9:37.
[4] Mk. 12:18 *sq.*

power and love. Men live because they belong to God, and he is the God of the living. We shall have occasion, later, to consider this passage more in detail.

Jesus' estimate of man grounded in two principles.

If, now, we ask for some general principle, or truth, which is adequate to supply a basis for this estimate of the value, possibilities, and prospect of man, we shall find it, I think, in man's native kinship to God. This idea has two aspects: (1) the fatherhood of God, in which Jesus' teaching concerning God's providence and gracious salvation is grounded; and (2) the natural sonship of man to God, in which is based Jesus' estimate of the infinite worth of the human soul and the prophecy of a higher and better life to come. The failure of man is so great, his sinfulness is so deplorable, because sin means the forfeiture of his true life in fellowship and likeness to God. Sin is an unfilial life, in which man loses the true character and sunders the true relations of sonship; salvation is a return to one's true self and to the Father — the recovery through the grace and forgiveness of God of the relation of obedience to God and of likeness to him. All is grounded in the fatherhood of God and in the proper sonship of man to God.

CHAPTER X

THE NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL WORLDS[1]

Questions covered by the title.

THIS title covers, not a distinct part of the teaching of Jesus, but a number of questions and topics which are either touched upon in his teaching or suggested by some of his sayings. They are such questions as these: What was his attitude toward the natural world, toward the social and political institutions of his time, and toward the supernatural realm of spirits, good and evil, whose agency held so large a place in the working theory of life which prevailed in his age?

The problem of Jesus' knowledge.

In connection with these topics a previous question inevitably arises in the mind, viz.: What were the scope and limits of Jesus' knowledge respecting such subjects as nature, history, and literature? Did he lay claim to complete, or even special, knowledge of these subjects; and, if he did not, are there reasons for thinking that he possessed such knowledge? If so, are those reasons directly presented in the Gospels, or are they to be derived by inference from the general representation which the Gospels furnish of his person? Three possible views may be taken in answer: (1) Jesus' knowledge of such subjects was limited to the measures of his age. (2) His knowl-

Three theories.

[1] General References: Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, I. 151–172; Beyschlag, *N. T. Theology*, Bk. I. ch. iv; Stevens, *Theology of the N. T.*, Part I. ch. vii; Moorhouse, *The Teaching of Christ; its Conditions, Secret, and Results*; Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*; Brooks, *The Influence of Jesus*, Lect. II; Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, pp. 50–78.

edge was subject to no limitation; he was omniscient. (3) We have not sufficient data for determining the scope and limits of his knowledge, nor have we any need to do so. The positive principle to be maintained is, that the whole stress of his teaching was laid upon interpreting the religious life; that he made no claims and assumed no function as a teacher in those fields of thought and fact which constitute the province of the modern sciences. It is from this point of view that we shall proceed in our present investigation.[1]

Four specific questions.

Within this field of inquiry there are four principal topics, which we shall briefly consider in order. What was the attitude of Jesus, what the presuppositions of his teaching and work, concerning the following subjects: (1) nature, (2) social and political institutions, (3) the history of literature of his people, (4) the world of spirits, good and evil?

Jesus' close observation of nature.

(1) There can be no doubt that Jesus was a keen observer of nature. His fondness for the country and his frequent references to nature's common moods and ordinary processes are proof enough of this. How often do we find him by the lakeside or upon the mountain! How frequently do we hear him discoursing upon what he observed in the fields, the

[1] That the knowledge of Jesus was subject to some limitations is clear from the Gospels. He "advanced in wisdom," as he did in stature (Lk. 2 : 52), and he explicitly declared that he did not know the time of his parousia (Mk. 13 : 32; Matt. 24 : 36). Those who hold, notwithstanding these passages, that Jesus was omniscient, say that he knew all things *as God*, but *as man* he did not know. So Hall, *The Kenotic Theory*, ch. x. See three articles on the supposed bearing of Jesus' sayings upon the authorship of Old Testament books, illustrating, in general, the three views named above, by Professors Toy, Stevens, and Hovey, in *The O. T. Student*, December, 1888, and January and February, 1889.

woods, and the sky! "Behold the birds of the heaven"; "Consider the lilies of the field how they grow"[1] — he exclaims, when he would call attention to God's bountiful provision for his creatures in nature. His parable-stories are largely made up of materials drawn from observation of the processes of nature. The character and development of the kingdom of God he illustrates by the growth of seeds and the spreading of leaven;[2] the mixture of good and evil in the world by the simultaneous growth of wheat and tares,[3] and the moral fruitlessness of some lives by the barren fig tree.[4] He spoke of the descending rain as a symbol of the beneficence of the divine Father. Its falling upon all without distinction was to him a symbol of God's boundless, universal love.[5] In the instincts of birds, the beauty of flowers, the radiation of the sun's light and heat, he saw examples of God's wisdom and mercy, and fit emblems of his free and abounding grace to mankind.

His interpretation of nature.

The Gospels make it clear to us that Jesus constantly derived refreshment and rest to his spirit from the contemplation of the world. He was keenly sensitive to the sublimity which is disclosed in the natural order; his mind ennobled nature's ordinary processes by discerning a divine meaning and beauty in them. Nature was to him the living garment in which the Eternal had robed his mysterious loveliness. The laws and processes of the world reveal and illustrate a divine order and providence; nature is instinct with life, "and every common bush afire with God."

Jesus' view of nature religious rather than scientific.

But the attitude of Jesus toward nature was that of the religious and poetic, not that of the scientific, in-

[1] Matt. 6 : 26, 28.
[2] Mk. 4 : 26–29; Matt. 13 : 31, 32; Lk. 13 : 20, 21.
[3] Matt. 13 : 24–30, 36–43.
[4] Lk. 13 : 6–9.
[5] Matt. 5 : 45.

terpreter. He never discoursed upon nature after the manner of a teacher of natural science, or sought to impart to men any knowledge of the material world beyond that commonly possessed by the people of his age. He spoke of natural phenomena in the popular language of his time, and never in the language to which modern science alone could give rise and meaning. His thoughts concerning nature were accordant with his general view which regarded all things as held within the sway of God's wise and loving purpose. His teaching contributes nothing to physical science; such an addition to human knowledge was absolutely foreign to his purpose. But that teaching illustrates what is far more important, namely, how the truly religious spirit sees God revealed in his world, and helps us also to "look through nature up to nature's God."

(2) We will next observe the allusions which Jesus made to the social and political institutions of his time.

His attitude to social life.

Jesus honored the social life of man. He not only mingled freely with his fellow-men as he casually met them in the fields and streets, but he often sought their society and gladly accepted their hospitality. He desired to make a visit at the house of Zacchæus, the rich publican.[1] He attended a feast which Levi made in his honor at which many from the despised classes were present.[2] Again, we see him sitting down to meat in the house of Simon the Pharisee, where the sinful woman broke the alabaster box of ointment upon his feet;[3] and, yet once more, we find him at the house of an influential Pharisee who had asked him to dine with him. This opportunity he seizes to point the difference between ceremonial and moral righteous-

[1] Lk. 19 : 5. [2] Mk. 2 : 15.
[3] Lk. 7 : 36 *sq.*

ness.[1] He seems to have been a frequent visitor at the home of Lazarus and his sisters in Bethany.[2] Clearly, then, there was no trace of the hermit in Jesus. He participated in life's social joys, and through them made the influence of his truth and personality felt upon the minds and hearts of men.

Teaching concerning the family and divorce

Our Lord recognized the institution of the family as sacred and divine. He said that the easy conditions on which, under the Mosaic law,[3] husbands might put away their wives, were permitted on account of the hardness of men's hearts, that is, were adapted to a rude state of society in which they were the best practicable regulations.[4] Jesus, however, forbade husbands thus to dismiss their wives, and declared that he who does so and then marries again commits adultery.[5] Over against this easy arbitrary separation he placed the original divine idea of the sexes and of marriage: "From the beginning of the creation, male and female made he them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh: so that they are no more twain, but one flesh."[6] Clearly the purpose of Jesus here is to exalt the sacredness of the marriage bond, and thereby to deny the arbitrary right of husbands to divorce their wives.[7]

[1] Lk. 11 : 37–41. [2] Lk. 10 : 40; Jn. 11 : 1 *sq.*

[3] An example of the "bill of divorcement," which the husband was required to give, may be seen in Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ* (Oxford, 1859), II, 124. In connection with this, illustrations are also given of the slight provocations on which husbands were accustomed to dismiss their wives. The law allowed this dismission only in case the husband had found "some unseemly thing" (Deut. 24 : 1) in his wife. This term was frequently interpreted to mean any cause of complaint or displeasure. Its real meaning was, no doubt, adultery.

[4] Mk. 10 : 5. [5] Mk. 10 : 11. [6] Mk. 10 : 6–8.

[7] Such is the import of the sayings as reported by Mark

Private property.

We have no reason to suppose that Jesus discussed, in general, such themes as the rights of private ownership. We can only say that private property was a recognized institution in his age, and that he made no objection to it. He speaks of the right use of earthly possessions, whereby they may be made a means of obtaining the true riches.[1] He commends Zacchæus for his generous proposal to give half his goods to the poor, but does not criticise his retention of the other half.[2] It is not easy to see how he could have used the relations and duties of landowners, householders, and stewards to illustrate the truths of his kingdom if he had looked with disfavor upon private ownership.

His estimate of worldly possessions.

On the other hand, Jesus set a wholly different estimate upon worldly possessions from that which is common among men. He recognized in wealth a great peril and snare on account of the pride and abuse of power to which it so frequently ministers. He found the love of riches one of the greatest obstacles to his truth and kingdom.[3] There are no more solemn warnings than those which he spoke against covetousness,[4] and no more severe condemnations than that which he directed against the worship of Mam-

(10 : 11) and Luke (16 : 18). To this saying, twice repeated, Matthew adds, "except for fornication" (5 : 32 ; 19 : 9). This addition makes the passage a statement of the condition on which the husband *may* dismiss his wife, whereas in the other Gospels the point is to assert the general principle that husbands are not at liberty to put away their wives at will. The addition of Matthew diverts the teaching from its primary intent. It is worth while, also, to observe that Jesus here says nothing on the question, on what grounds a state may authorize divorce. He is speaking to a question of his age, namely : Is the common dismission of wives by husbands allowable? He condemns the custom as contrary to the sacredness of marriage.

[1] Lk. 16 : 9–11.
[2] Lk. 19 : 8.
[3] Mk. 4 : 19 ; 10 : 23, 24.
[4] Lk. 12 : 13–21.

mon.[1] He taught that earthly goods were insignificant in value compared with the interests of man's inner life, and that any sacrifice of the former should be freely made when demanded for the protection or promotion of the latter.[2] In one instance, in order to test a self-satisfied moralist who half defied him to name a "good thing" which he had not done, Jesus challenged him to sell his possessions and give them to the poor.[3] The demand was evidently made in view of the special character and claims of the rich young ruler, since no similar demand was ever made of any other person. It was a striking, concrete way of teaching the utter triviality of material as compared with moral values. He did not, however, condemn the rich *as such*, nor did he regard worldly possessions as *necessarily* evil. They may, on the contrary, be made a powerful instrument of good.[4]

Not ascetic in life.

It quite agrees with what we have observed thus far that Jesus did not assume the garb or the habits of an ascetic. "The Son of man (unlike John the Baptist) came eating and drinking."[5] He submitted to the charge of being "a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber," to which his genial mode of life gave occasion, rather than adopt a course of abstinence whose logical ground is the assumption of the inherent evil of the things of the world. He recognized such things as food and raiment as God's good gifts to supply the needs of his creatures.[6] For him as for the Psalmist, the earth was the Lord's and the fulness thereof.[7] Jesus' renunciation of the world was quite different from that of the ascetic. He never commended self-denial for its own sake or condemned the harmless

[1] Matt. 6 : 24.
[2] Matt. 5 : 40–42; Lk. 12 : 15, 21, 33, 34.
[3] Mk. 10 : 21, 22.
[4] Lk. 16 : 9–11.
[5] Lk. 7 : 34.
[6] Matt. 6 : 32, 33.
[7] Ps. 24 : 1.

joys and comforts of life. He conquered the world, not by a cowardly renunciation of it, but by subduing it to the higher uses of the spirit.

Civil authority.

The attitude of Jesus toward civil authority and power must be inferred from a few incidental allusions and circumstances. His most noteworthy saying touching the subject is, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."[1] In these words he clearly recognizes a province of civil authority, as well as a sphere of religious duty. He approves the payment of taxes for the support of the State, but implies that this is a trifling obligation compared with rendering obedience to God. In like manner he recommends conformity to the usage of his people in the payment of tribute for the support of the temple service, though recognizing the freedom of himself and his disciples from the requirement to sustain the Jewish ritual.[2] When we observe the life of Jesus as a whole we find that he was an obedient and loyal citizen; he respected the customs and laws of his country; he was not an eccentric or lawless person.

Disclaims political aims.

He disclaimed, however, for himself and his kingdom any political character or prerogatives. When many wished to make him a king he withdrew into the solitude of the mountain,[3] and when his disciples, dreaming of worldly power, began to request places of prominence in the empire which they supposed he would found, he replied: "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever would be first among you shall

[1] Mk. 12 : 17. [2] Matt. 17 : 24–27.
[3] Jn. 6 : 15.

be servant of all. For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."[1] When, later, he entered Jerusalem as the confessed Messiah of his people and permitted himself to be hailed as the King of Israel, he did so in a manner which proclaimed, not pride and power, but meekness and lowliness. He entered the city in the spirit depicted by Zechariah, riding, not upon a horse, the symbol of war, but upon an ass, the symbol of peace, thus fulfilling the prophetic picture: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee: he is just and having salvation; lowly and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass."[2]

His triumphal entry into Jerusalem.

(3) With respect to the history and literature of Israel, Jesus spoke the language of his time. He spoke of books under the names of their traditional authors, and freely used various Old Testament stories for illustrating his truth. Some think that by these allusions the authority of Jesus as a teacher is committed to the correctness of the Jewish traditional beliefs alluded to. The argument is that Jesus spoke of the Pentateuch as "the book of Moses"[3] and as containing what "Moses wrote" or "commanded,"[4] and alluded to certain Psalms as containing what "David said";[5] therefore we must hold that Moses and David wrote the books in question, unless we are to surrender the authority of Jesus. In like manner, Jesus' allusion to Jonah is supposed to authenticate the historical character of the Jonah narrative in the Old Testament.[6]

References to Jewish history and literature.

[1] Mk. 10 : 42–45.
[2] Zech. 9 : 9; Matt. 21 : 5.
[3] Mk. 12 : 26.
[4] Mk. 7 : 10; Matt. 8 : 4.
[5] Mk. 12 : 36.
[6] In this case, however, it is to be noted that the Jonah-sign, according to Luke, is Jonah's preaching (11 : 29–32), as, indeed,

Did it suit the views and needs of those who adopt this mode of argument to do so, they would be able to show, on the same presuppositions, how the allusions of Jesus to the material world and to the mental constitution of man have set bounds and given law to all physical science and intellectual philosophy.

Not a teacher of criticism.

To me it seems not only unwarranted, but derogatory to Jesus, to suppose that he meant to pronounce upon questions of science, history, and criticism — partly because these questions did not exist in his age, and partly because he concerned himself for what was infinitely more important. To those who wish to drag him into their controversies in criticism I cannot help thinking that he would reply as he did to those persons in his time who sought to engage him in disputes which did not concern his great life-work: Who made me a judge among you?[1] How grandly did he concentrate his whole attention and effort upon the work which he had come to do as the Founder of the kingdom of God! How "magnificently forgetful" was he of all that lay aside from the path of his revealing and saving mission!

(4) A fourth topic can only be briefly considered: The references of Jesus to the spirit-world.[2]

it is also for Matthew (12:41, 42). This was doubtless the original import of Jesus' allusion to the Jonah-story, a use of it which accords perfectly with the purpose and spirit of the Book of Jonah (3:4). But the first Evangelist (alone) has also introduced (12:40) a parallel between Jonah's being three days in the belly of a sea monster and Jesus' three days' burial, thereby bringing forward an idea quite foreign to the passage as a whole, and giving an entirely different meaning to the Jonah-sign. It is only from this addition, of very doubtful originality, that the above argument is constructed. Cf. Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, p. 103; Holtzmann, *Hand-Com., in loco.*

[1] Lk. 12:14.

[2] I have discussed it at length in my *Theology of the N. T.*, Pt. I, ch. vii.

References to the spirit-world.

We find that he speaks of heaven, of angels, and of evil spirits in the manner which was common among the Jews of his time. Heaven is the seat of the divine majesty, or a symbol of the divine activity, authority, or government.[1] He refers to Hades as the general abode of the dead,[2] and to Paradise as the place of happiness in Hades.[3] To angels he made frequent references as the ministers and guardians of himself and others, and as accompanying him at his glorious coming.[4] Satan, who in the Old Testament is Jehovah's messenger for inflicting physical evils upon men, is, in the teaching of Jesus, the evil one, the tempter to sin.[5] Jesus also speaks after the manner of his time of men being "possessed" or inhabited by evil spirits. If two doubtful cases are counted, there are seven narratives of "possession" in the Synoptics.[6]

Demoniacal possession.

Figurative or poetic references to these subjects.

We find, however, several instances in which these various ideas are employed by Jesus in a poetic or figurative sense. He says, for example, that he might summon "twelve legions of angels" to protect him against his enemies.[7] His "little ones" have each his guardian angel.[8] Lazarus is carried after his death "by the angels into Abraham's bosom."[9] When the Seventy returned from their successful mission he expressed his joy at their success by exclaiming, "I

[1] Matt. 5 : 12; Mk. 11 : 30; Lk. 12 : 33; 15 : 18.
[2] Lk. 16 : 23. [3] Lk. 22 : 43.
[4] Mk. 8 : 38; 12 : 25; 13 : 32; Matt. 18 : 10; 26 : 53; Lk. 16 : 22.
[5] Matt. 4 : 1–11; 13 : 18; Mk. 4 : 15; Lk. 22 : 31.
[6] Mk. 1 : 21 *sq.*; 5 : 1 *sq.*; Matt. 9 : 32, 33; Mk. 7 : 25 *sq.*; Matt. 17 : 15. The healing of the "blind and dumb" man (Matt. 12 : 22) may be a repetition of the similar case already related in Matt. 9 : 32, 33 (so Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, p. 100). The "woman whom Satan had bound" (Lk. 13 : 16) is not said to have been "possessed," though she was probably so regarded. No similar "possession" is recognized in the fourth Gospel.
[7] Matt. 26 : 53. [8] Matt. 18 : 10. [9] Lk. 16 : 22.

beheld Satan falling as lightning from heaven."[1] He even applies the term "Satan" to Peter when the apostle opposes his pursuit of his divinely appointed career of suffering.[2] We find that he sometimes attributes to the "spirit" inhabiting the "possessed" person the character of the disease. Thus he speaks of a "dumb spirit," and of a "spirit of infirmity," that is, producing infirmity.[3] Sometimes he personifies the disease itself. Thus Peter's mother-in-law was "holden" with a violent fever, which Jesus "rebuked."[4] In one place he describes an "unclean spirit" wandering through desert wastes seeking a habitation, and finally associating with himself seven companion spirits, more evil than himself, and returning to dwell in the man whom he had formerly possessed.[5] The description is intended to illustrate the tendency of men to relapse, after temporary amendment, into a worse state of sin. If read as an apologue, it is appropriate and forceful; if understood as a literal description of facts it is singularly grotesque.

How "possession" is to be understood.

If the term "possession" were not used in describing the seven cases of physical and mental maladies above referred to, we should experience no difficulty whatever in accounting for their symptoms as characteristics of various disorders of mind and body. This is the conclusion to which all the known facts point. It can be averted only in case it can be shown that Jesus must have positively authenticated as correct every popular idea to which he referred. Such a view is not only inherently improbable, as being inconsistent with the nature and limits of his life-work, but quite inapplicable to some of the passages in which refer-

[1] Lk. 10:17.
[2] Mk. 8:33.
[3] Mk. 9:17; Lk. 13:11.
[4] Lk. 4:38, 39.
[5] Matt. 12:43–45; Lk. 11:24–26.

ence is made to the subject in question. Jesus used the current thought-forms of his age for his purpose — the teaching of the way of God in truth. It is inconceivable that he could have accomplished his purpose in any other way. Had he spoken the language of modern science — for example, of modern astronomy or medical science — his teaching would have had no meaning or power for the people of his time. He must work with the media furnished by the thought-world of his age, and offer men his heavenly treasure of truth and life in the earthen vessels of human pictorial language and thinking.

CHAPTER XI

THE RELIGION OF A GOOD LIFE[1]

Christianity a moral religion.

THE great philosopher, Kant, has affirmed that Christianity is the only moral religion, that is, the religion of a good life.[2] Whether Christianity is the *only* moral religion may be open to dispute, but there is no room for doubt that the religion which Jesus taught and exemplified was moral to the core, that is, was wholly concerned with righteousness of life. How men ought to live, that is, to think and feel and act, in their relations to God and their fellows, is the constant and comprehensive theme of Jesus' teaching.

The doctrine of righteousness.

It was agreed on all hands by the people of Jesus' time that it was necessary for men to be righteous before God. The great difference between Jesus and his age was with respect to what constituted righteousness. To the men of his time it was a legal and ceremonial, to him it was a moral, affair. "I fast twice in the week and pay tithes of all that I possess";[3] "I have observed all the commandments from my youth,"[4] — these were typical expressions of the "righteousness" which the representative Jew of Jesus' time was

[1] General References: Beyschlag, *N. T. Theology*, Bk. I, ch. v; Stevens, *The Theology of the N. T.*, Pt. I, ch. ix; *The Johannine Theology*, ch. ix; article "Righteousness in N. T.," in Hastings' *B. D.*; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, chs. viii, ix; Horton, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 95–108; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, Pt. II; Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums*, 45–50.

[2] See Kant's *Theory of Ethics*, ed. by T. K. Abbott, p. 360.

[3] Lk. 18 : 12. [4] Mk. 10 : 20.

proudly conscious of possessing. Jesus' conception of righteousness is expressed in the principle of love to God and man which is the essence of all commandments.[1] Jesus does not deny the propriety and possible moral worth of the deeds which were popularly regarded as constituting righteousness. "These ought ye to have done," he said on one occasion, "but not to leave undone," the more important things, the exercise of justice and mercy, and of love toward God.[2] The two views of righteousness were not in all points and necessarily exclusive each of the other. But they differed so completely in emphasis that they always tended to become mutually exclusive. For the Jew ritual held the first place; for Jesus morality held the first place. With the Jew the chief emphasis was laid upon certain acts; with Jesus it was laid upon certain dispositions.

Illustrations.

From this starting-point let us collate the various expressions and illustrations which Jesus gave of his doctrine of a good life. If righteousness is acceptableness to God, conformity to God's requirements, then the answer of Jesus to the question, in what does righteousness consist? would unquestionably be, it consists in love. He teaches that love is the essence of God's law, and that it is therefore in the life of love that man realizes his sonship to God. Love is God-likeness, and therefore the principle of the perfect life.[3] The righteousness of the members of the kingdom of God — which must be superior to the outward, legal righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees[4] — is clearly conceived of as consisting in love and its exercise, since Jesus immediately proceeds to show how the true righteousness forbids impurity, anger, and hate, and

[1] Matt. 22 : 40.
[2] Lk. 11 : 42.
[3] Mk. 12 : 28–31; Matt. 5 : 48.
[4] Matt. 5 : 20.

requires and secures self-control, generosity, and benevolence.[1] When he was asked for a law by the observance of which one might attain eternal life, he cited the law of love.[2] Love, then, *is* righteousness. The kingdom and the righteousness of God are to be sought and won by loving God supremely, and one's neighbor as himself.

What is love?

But what, then, is love, and what specifically does it require? Jesus nowhere formally defines love, but he so fully illustrates its nature and action that we are at no loss to obtain a clear idea of its meaning. The elements of the true righteousness, which consists in love, may readily be gathered from the "Sermon on the Mount." The qualities enumerated in the Beatitudes — such as humility, meekness, mercifulness, purity of heart, and peaceableness — are among the characteristics of a true love to God and man. Love prompts to "good deeds,"[3] to reconciliation among brethren,[4] to self-restraint and discipline,[5] to straightforwardness and truthfulness in speech,[6] to kindness and a forgiving spirit, even toward those who have done us injury.[7] Love requires simplicity as opposed to hypocrisy,[8] sincerity as opposed to ostentation.[9] Love to God will lead men to trust him and will thereby deliver them from distracting anxieties;[10] it will make men charitable, and indisposed to judge others with undue severity.[11] Above all, love to God will place him alone on the throne of the world, and will bow down to and serve no other master. It will make God supreme and place his kingdom first.[12] Thus it will unify and concentrate all life by directing its interests

[1] Matt. 5 : 21–48.
[2] Lk. 10 : 25–28.
[3] Matt. 5 : 16.
[4] Matt. 5 : 22.
[5] Matt. 5 : 29.
[6] Matt. 5 : 37.
[7] Matt. 5 : 44.
[8] Matt. 6 : 1–4.
[9] Matt. 6 : 5–8.
[10] Matt. 6 : 19–34.
[11] Matt. 7 : 1–5.
[12] Matt. 6 : 33.

and efforts to the one supreme and sufficient goal — union with God through moral likeness to him.

How love to God is shown.

Love to God, then, is evidenced by trust in God's providence and by the living of a life like that of God in its generosity, its helpfulness, and its readiness to forgive. To love God is to choose his perfect life as our pattern and goal, and to live in the spirit of it. Such is the first and great commandment, and the second is like unto it.

Love to man.

Love to man is shown in a Godlike estimate and treatment of him. Such love requires that men strive to realize for their fellow-men the ends of the divine love; that they estimate the rights and value of others as equal to their own, and regard and treat others in accord with those universal principles and laws of love and truth which are disclosed in the divine treatment of men. The righteousness of God is perfect, holy love, and the law of love for men is likeness to God in disposition and action.

A concrete example.

What such love requires Jesus often illustrated, thereby affording us a clear view of his conception of love's nature. The parable of the Good Samaritan is a striking example.[1] In it he shows us at once what is the scope and the action of true love. Such love is universal; it knows nothing of the boundaries which separate social classes. The law of love demands that even a despised Samaritan, if in distress, shall be served and helped. It requires something more than a compassionate sentiment or a patronizing pity. It requires action and effort, and, if need be, sacrifice. It is not satisfied with the theoretic sympathy which says, "Depart in peace, be warmed and filled,"[2] but demands that what the sufferer's necessities require *be done*.

A more general statement.

A more sweeping, abstract statement of this principle Jesus gave when he taught

[1] Lk. 10 : 29–37. [2] Jas. 2 : 17.

his disciples that they were not merely to love those who loved them, — to do that is only to obey a universal human instinct, — but to love also those who hated and injured them. "I say unto you, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you."[1] Why? "In order that you may become [or, prove yourselves to be] the sons of your Father who is in heaven,"[2] for he loves and blesses all. From these passages it is clear that one's "neighbor" is any one whom he can help, and that love is, by its nature, large and generous, giving out in sympathy and service to all who come within the reach of its power.

Love and prudence.

Love is not a calculating prudence which renders its services because it hopes for reward in return. The spirit of love is no longer present in benefits conferred in the hope of receiving as much again. Such a temper is too much infected with selfish motives to deserve the name of love. It is, no doubt, in the light of this principle that we are to understand the sayings about turning the other cheek to the smiter, and giving the coat also to him who asks the cloak.[3] It is a hyperbolic expression of the generosity of love in contrast to the cold, calculating prudence and slightly enlarged selfishness which bestow benefits only upon favorites — which care only for those of "our set" and despise those from whom no gratification is to be derived. Such "love" does not rise above the morals of heathenism;[4] it has never been touched by a sense of God's fatherhood or of the brotherhood of men.

Love requires forgiveness.

Love also requires that men be always ready to forgive injuries upon condition of repentance on the part

[1] Lk. 6 : 27, 28; Matt. 5 : 44.
[2] Matt. 5 : 45.
[3] Matt. 6 : 40.
[4] Matt. 5 : 47.

of the wrong-doer. This, too, is a corollary from the nature of God. He is always forgiving, but he requires sincere repentance. The law of likeness to God requires that we be willing to do as God does. Hence God's forgiveness of us is conditioned upon our cherishing a forgiving spirit toward others. "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."[1] Hence in the model prayer which Jesus taught his disciples, the petition for forgiveness runs, "And forgive us our debts, as we also *have forgiven* our debtors."[2] Forgiveness on our part is conceived as a condition precedent of our receiving the divine forgiveness, because the forgiving spirit is a test and measure of the desire for Godlikeness; he whose forgiveness does not wait, ready to be granted to any who have injured him, thereby shows that he repudiates the life of love and refuses to recognize, honor, and obey it. He erects a barrier against the divine forgiveness because he refuses to place his own life under the law of forgiveness; by showing no mercy he withdraws himself from the forum of merciful judgment.[3] Like the unmerciful servant in the parable,[4] he takes himself beyond the pale of mercy by his refusal to submit his own life to its law. The Master could only be wroth with one who spurned the law of compassion. To receive the benefits of the divine law of love while trampling upon its most elementary and obvious demands, is impossible. Hence the merciless

Why forgiveness is required.

[1] Matt. 6 : 17, 18.

[2] Matt. 6 : 12. The best modern texts have the perfect tense (ἀφήκαμεν). Luke, however, has the present tense (ἀφίομεν). The former is probably the more original. So Wendt (*Lehre Jesu*, p. 98), and Weiss (*Matthäusev., ad loc.*).

[3] Jas. 2 : 13.

[4] Matt. 18 : 21–35.

servant is remanded to the operation of the only law which he will recognize — the law of strict retribution and payment. "So," adds Jesus, "shall my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye forgive not every one his brother from your hearts."[1]

The passive virtues.

There are some expressions in the Sermon on the Mount which, if taken by themselves, might seem to favor the idea that the life which Jesus required was a passive and quiescent one. Certain it is that Jesus commended the passive virtues — meekness, peaceableness, and the patient endurance of wrong. He taught that it was better to suffer repeated injury than to be drawn into conflict by the spirit of revenge.[2] And does not all experience prove that he was right? Difficult as it is for men to adopt his view and practically to proceed upon it, it is the only principle which the law of love can sanction. The disposition to rush into conflict with a view to outdoing the injury and wrong which one has experienced at the hands of another is a source of untold mischief in human life. It is a method of conduct which foments and fosters the worst passions of men. It breeds jealousy, cruelty, and hate. It cures no evils, but is the fruitful cause of evils. He who yields to revenge and hatred is himself the victim of sin. He is "overcome of evil." He is seeking to compensate one evil by another, probably by a greater one, whereas evil can only be overcome with good.

Patience *vs.* vengeance.

In these expressions Jesus is no more discussing the abstract question of the maintenance of one's rights than elsewhere he is discussing the abstract question of divorce. He is contrasting the policy of patience and peacemaking with the policy of vengeance in application to personal relations. Elsewhere he recognized the rights of men, and asserted

[1] Matt. 18 : 35. [2] Matt. 5 : 38–42.

his own.[1] He resented the treatment which he received at his trial,[2] but he did not resort to revenge. He would not permit the use of force in his defence;[3] but it would be unwarranted to infer from this that there could be no conditions in which the sword might properly be used in defence of human rights. Certainly love is not so wholly altruistic that it has no regard for self. On the contrary, Jesus commanded that one love his neighbor as himself — not more or better. That there is a proper regard for one's own interests and rights is assumed in the maxim. Love requires every man to conserve and maintain those interests which constitute the true value of life. It therefore requires self-affirmation and not self-effacement. But this self-maintenance and self-development will best be secured, not by an eagerness to repay every injury in kind, but by that true conquest over the evil man which is won only by the spirit of kindness and forgiveness.

Self-respect and self-preservation not excluded.

The true righteousness requires that deeds of charity or worship be done with sincerity and simplicity, and not with ostentation. When men fast or pray or give alms in order to attract attention to their generosity or piety, they "have no reward of the Father which is in heaven." They receive only the reward which they seek, and need look for no other.[4] Jesus illustrates this thought most fully in connection with his teaching concerning prayer. The very meaning of prayer is annulled when it is offered in synagogues and on street-corners, with a view to attracting the attention of observers. Prayer is communion between the soul and God, and it best befits its nature that it should be offered in secret.[5] Nor does true prayer

The law for deeds of charity and worship.

[1] Lk. 17:3; 18:15.
[2] Jn. 18:23.
[3] Matt. 26:52.
[4] Matt. 6:2, 5.
[5] Matt. 6:6.

God a willing giver.

consist in the persistent repetition of the same wish or cry, after the manner of the Baal-worshippers.[1] Such "vain repetitions" proceed upon the false, heathen notion that the Deity is reluctant to grant his favors, and that his unwilling mind is to be won over by the wearisome rehearsal of the same demand.[2] He who knows God as the heavenly Father, however, will rest in the confidence of his willingness and desire to grant to his children all good and needful things; and will ask, in the conviction that God is more ready to grant his favors to his true worshippers than earthly parents are to give good gifts to their children.[3] Here, again, it appears how the religion of a good life is grounded in the knowledge of God as the Father, and in the realization in thought and conduct of man's true sonship to God.

Love requires deeds and services.

The life of love to God and man will be a life of action and of service. In the view of Jesus, love is an energetic power which sets all the faculties of the soul in vigorous operation. If men truly love God, they will do his will. It avails nothing to profess allegiance which is not evidenced by obedience.[4] The way of righteousness is a strait one, and is entered by a narrow gate;[5] that is, the Christian life is not a lax and lawless life, but one upon which strict and strenuous demands are made. Accordingly, Jesus often depicts in his parables the nature of the true life as involving watchfulness, fidelity, and labor. "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" is the reproachful challenge of the master in the parable of the Vineyard.[6] Christ's disciples are laborers,[7] servants,[8] stewards.[9] Their life is one of duty and responsibility.

[1] 1 Kings 18 : 26.
[2] Matt. 6 : 7.
[3] Matt. 6 : 8; Lk. 11 : 13.
[4] Matt. 7 : 24–27.
[5] Matt. 7 : 13, 14.
[6] Matt. 20 : 6.
[7] Matt. 20 : 1.
[8] Lk. 12 : 37.
[9] Lk. 16 : 1 *sq.*

Yet its law is not that of a mechanical legalism, but that of grace and generosity. The faithful use of one talent is as highly approved as the corresponding use of ten.[1] Those who entered the vineyard at the eleventh hour received the same remuneration as those who began work in the early morning.[2] The labors of love are not quantitatively measured. Their value is determined by the motives and dispositions out of which they spring. The principle of the divine procedure with men is not the legal principle of debit and credit, but the moral principle of grace. God treats men better than they deserve. But if men will reap the benefits of this divine law of love, they must consent to put their own lives under its sway. Love is a reciprocal principle; it is a law of right relationships among persons. Hence the bestowment of the benefits of the divine love is conditioned upon the attitude of humility, obedience, and kindred dispositions on the part of men. Love prescribes the appropriate conditions of bestowing its largess. This is the principle which the Apostle Paul elaborated with such incisiveness in his "gospel" of grace and faith — grace, the divine procuring cause of salvation; faith, the human attitude of receptiveness and of trust.

Grace *vs.* legalism.

Conditions prescribed by love.

[1] Matt. 25 : 27. [2] Matt. 20 : 9, 15.

CHAPTER XII

THE MEANS OF SALVATION[1]

The question to be considered.

We have seen in the previous chapter what was the nature of the saved life; we have now to inquire by what means this salvation is wrought. The righteous life, or eternal life, as it is commonly called in the fourth Gospel, is a life of Godlike love; Jesus is the Messenger and Bearer of that life to men; how does he procure it for them, or arouse and foster it in them? We will review his own representations on this subject as reported, first, in the Synoptics, and next in the Gospel of John.

The conditions of salvation.

The conditions of salvation which men are to fulfil are repentance and faith.[2] In other words, men must renounce and forsake the sinful life and commit themselves to the life of obedience and sonship to God. These thoughts are expressed in a great variety of forms. Coming to Christ, taking his yoke, learning of him, taking up his cross, entering or receiving the kingdom of God, — all these are forms of expression for the appropriation, in humility and self-surrender, of the gracious salvation which Christ came to bring. He came to save the lost, and if men are to receive

[1] General References: *The N. T. Theologies* of Beyschlag, Bk. I, ch. vi, and Stevens, Part I, ch. x; *The Johannine Theology*, ch. vii; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, II, 184–264; Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, ch. x; Cone, *The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations*, pp. 109–118; Horton, *Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 109–123, 219–250; Stalker, *The Christology of Jesus*, ch. v.

[2] Mk. 1 : 15; Matt. 13 : 15; Mk. 9 : 42.

his salvation, they must recognize and confess their need of it. The self-satisfied who count themselves already righteous and who believe that they need no repentance will have no ear for his message, no welcome for his truth.

By what means does Christ propose to impart the gift of spiritual life to men? The answer which one may gather from his own words may be summed up in three statements: —

By what means Christ saves men

(1) He saves men by his teaching. He reveals God to man in his instruction concerning the divine fatherhood and providence; he reveals man to himself in his teaching that man is God's child and finds his true life only in fellowship with God and likeness to him. A part of Jesus' saving mission was to preach good tidings and to reveal to men the mysteries of the kingdom of God. The great sign which he gave was the declaration of his heavenly truth. "Learn of me," he said, "and ye shall find rest unto your souls."[1] He taught the way of God in truth, declaring to men what were the nature and requirements of God and what the true principles and motives of human life.

(1) By teaching.

(2) He brought to bear upon men a saving power through his personal example and influence. What he taught was grounded in what he was. The truth which he uttered was spoken out of his personal consciousness and experience. Hence he offered men, not merely maxims or definitions of truth, but a personal embodiment of it in his own life and work. He asked not only that his statements be believed, but that men receive *him* as their Master and Lord. He claimed perfectly to know the Father and to be the Mediator of the Father's love to mankind. On the ground of this unique relation to God he said to men: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden,

(2) By personal example and influence.

[1] Matt. 11: ~~5~~ 29

Christ's teaching inseparable from his person.

and I will give you rest."[1] He spoke the truth of God to men; but the deeper fact is that he *was* the truth — the truth of God's mind, feeling, and nature. "The words of Christ," says Dr. Hort, "were so completely parts and utterances of himself, that they had no meaning as abstract statements of truth uttered by him as a divine organ or prophet. Take away himself as the primary (though not the ultimate) subject of every statement, and they all fall to pieces. Take away their cohesion with his acts and his whole known person and presence, and they lose their power. The disciples did well to gather from them that he was the Holy One of God, the chosen and heavenly means by which God imparts, not guidance only, or knowledge only, but the Life that is above."[2]

(3) By his death.

(3) To the death of Christ a special saving significance is ascribed. Quite early in his ministry Jesus intimated that death would be his fate: "The days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away."[3] Later he intimated that his death would prove to be a test of attachment to him, drawing some to him in fervent devotion and repelling others: "I came to cast fire on the earth, and what will I, if it is already kindled? But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" He then declared that the effect of his work would be the division of households.[4] He thus foretold how some would glory in his cross and passion, while to others his sufferings would be the ground of his rejection.[5]

Jesus announces the necessity of his death.

But it was only after Peter's confession of his Messiahship at Cæsarea Philippi that Jesus explicitly proclaimed the certainty of his violent death: "And

[1] Matt. 11 : 28.
[2] *The Way the Truth and the Life*, p. 207.
[3] Mk. 2 : 20. [4] Lk. 12 : 49–53. [5] 1 Cor. 1 : 18.

he began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders, and the chief priests, and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again."[1] The announcement struck consternation to the hearts of the disciples, who had still continued to cherish the common Jewish hopes of Messiah's victory and reign. The notion that the Messiah should suffer and die was to them intolerable. It meant that he should fail to establish the kingdom of God, and that was contrary to all their deepest convictions concerning Messiah's character and work, and a contradiction to the promise of God, as they understood it. Hence Peter's protest: "Be it far from thee, Lord; this shall never be unto thee."[2] To this, however, Jesus replied that the path of suffering was the divinely appointed way in which he must walk, and that his disciples must not expect to derive any worldly or political advantages from their connection with him, but must be prepared, instead, to suffer for his sake and to bear a heavy cross of self-denial in his service.[3] For sacrifice and service are the laws of his kingdom, and he who would save his life must give it in self-denying love.[4]

Required by the law of sacrifice.

Two other passages bear upon Jesus' view of his approaching death. When James and John expressed the wish that they might have places of honor and power in his future world-kingdom, he replied: "Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink? or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they said unto him, We are able. And Jesus said unto them, The cup that I drink ye shall drink; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized: but to sit on my right hand or on *my* left hand is not mine to give:

His "cup" and "baptism."

[1] Mk. 8:31.
[2] Matt. 16:22.
[3] Mk. 8:33, 34.
[4] Mk. 8:35.

but *it is for them* for whom it hath been prepared."[1] He thus set in sharpest contrast their view of the kingdom and its triumphs and his own. Not power and glory, but humility and service, are to be the marks of his reign. Greatness in his kingdom is to be won, not by force, but by service. He continued: "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all. For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many."[2]

Greatness by service.

The other passage is the word of Jesus at the institution of the memorial supper: "This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many."[3] Matthew's version of the words is more explicit in its reference to the relation between the death of Jesus and salvation from sin: "This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many *unto remission of sins*."[4]

The blood shed for many.

What we have, then, in the Synoptic Gospels concerning the death of the Messiah is, first, the announcement that the hostility of the rulers would certainly culminate in his death; second, the assertion that this result was providentially appointed; third, that the law of self-giving is the general law of Christ's kingdom and that his disciples must therefore be ready to give their lives in self-denying service, and, if need be, in suffering; fourth, that the death of the Messiah was to be, not, as they feared, an occasion of defeat and disaster to the disciples, but a means of incalculable benefit. His blood is to be shed on behalf of, that is, for the advantage of, many; his

Four statements concerning the saving significance of his death.

[1] Mk. 10 : 38–41.
[2] Mk. 10 : 42–45.
[3] Mk. 14 : 24.
[4] Matt. 26 : 28.

death will ransom, that is, deliver, many. And from what should it deliver them, if not from the power of sin? To what result could such deliverance look except to that which Matthew specifies, namely, "to the remission of sins"?

How does his death save?

The question now arises: How does the death of Christ avail to deliver men from sin? That the passages reviewed imply, and even in some cases state, that the death of Christ has saving power, is certain. But it is equally certain that they do not state *why* or *how* his death should possess such value or significance. We are left to infer the answer. Let me enumerate some of the principal replies which have been given to the question.

Theories.

(1) The ransom theory.

(1) The oldest theory fixed upon the word "ransom" and conceived of Christ's life as a price paid to procure the release of man from sin. The most consistent form of the theory represented this price as paid to Satan to induce him to release man from his power. This theory is built upon the implications of a figurative word.

(2) Delivers from fear of death.

(2) The meaning is that Jesus gives his life for many (that is, for his disciples) as a means of protecting them, or delivering them, from the fear of death. The death of Jesus is an example of supreme devotion to God, by the inspiration and imitation of which men are enabled to rise into the life of obedience, and are thus delivered from the dominion of evil.

(3) Saves from false views of life.

(3) By his death Christ broke the bonds which held his disciples in captivity to low and earthly conceptions of his salvation. For example, he ransomed James and John from their worldly ambition to occupy seats of honor in his kingdom.

(4) Incidental to establishing the kingdom.

(4) Christ was ready to endure whatever was necessary to the fulfilment of his Messianic calling. He had come to establish the kingdom of God, and when

he found that it was only by a career of suffering, culminating in death, that he could accomplish his God-given task, he trustfully accepted his fate as part of a loving Father's plan. He saves men by performing his divine life-task, which required the endurance of suffering and death. He did his work, and that work involved the cross.

(5) Representative and vicarious.

(5) The death of Christ was representative and vicarious, a proof at once of the divine love and a disclosure of the evil of sin and of God's holy displeasure against it. This view interprets the relation between Christ's death and salvation from sin in accord with Paul's teaching that Christ's sufferings and death declared the righteousness of God, and so safeguarded the divine self-consistency in forgiveness.

Before commenting on the question which has been raised, let us briefly review the representation of Jesus concerning the import of his death as reported in the fourth Gospel.

Jesus' statements according to the fourth Gospel.

Christ describes himself as the bearer and giver of life;[1] as the true bread of God which came down from heaven and gives life to the world;[2] as the good shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep.[3] He refers, in highly mystic language, to the eating of his flesh and the drinking of his blood, that is, the appropriation of his very self, as necessary to salvation.[4] He speaks of laying down his life for his friends,[5] and illustrates the saving value of his death by this analogical saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit."[6] He also speaks of drawing all men unto him when he shall have been lifted up.[7] His cross, which to men is the symbol of

[1] Jn. 5:19 *sq.* [2] Jn. 6:32 *sq.* [3] Jn. 10:11. [4] Jn. 6:53, 54. [5] Jn. 15:13. [6] Jn. 12:24. [7] Jn. 12:32.

his humiliation, is really the means of his exaltation to a place of influence and power from which he will draw the hearts of men to himself in interest, gratitude, and love.

Résumé.

What view, then, shall we form, from the reported words of Jesus himself, of the saving import of his death? As the subject does not here admit of extended discussion, I will present the following suggestions: —

Jesus' own distinguished from later views.

(1) It is necessary to consider the words of Jesus apart from all subsequent interpretations of the meaning of his death. It was soon construed in terms of the Jewish sacrificial system. Did Jesus conceive or present it in that light?

Does not use altar terms.

(2) In all the sayings of Jesus reviewed we find none of the Jewish altar terms. Of the technical terms which are common in theological discussions of the death of Christ — atonement, penalty, substitution, satisfaction, expiation, and the like — we find but one, "ransom," and that is used in the untechnical sense of a means of saving or of recovering.

His death not isolated from his life-work in general.

(3) Jesus did not isolate his death from his life and work, and attribute to it a separate saving power. He viewed his death as the culmination of his saving mission. His whole life-work was saving, and his death was the culminating act of that life of self-giving. He came to seek and to save, to minister and to give his life for men. It is clear that the giving of his life means more than the act or experience of dying. This giving up of life is closely correlated with his whole life-work of serving love. Just so in the fourth Gospel. While still living and laboring among men, he speaks of himself as the bestower of eternal life and of a present giving of his life for others. He was even then the bread of life. He was already saving men. He could not, therefore, have regarded his prospective death as the sole saving deed.

A part of his saving mission.

(4) It follows that the death of Jesus is to be interpreted in the light of his whole saving mission on earth as he himself conceived it. His death was a part of the fulfilment of his vocation. The object of his death was the same as the object of his life. He did not live for one end and die for another. Such an idea would mar the unity of his saving work, and is without the slightest support in his own teaching.

An interpretation of God.

(5) Now the object of Christ's life-work was to reveal God, to enable men to know God as their Father, and then to live as his true sons. Christ was the revealer of God — the translation of God into terms of human life. All that he did and experienced had its meaning as a part of this unveiling of God to man and the disclosure of man to himself. In this purpose the death of Christ at the hands of sinners must also have had its place.

Its relation to God's grace and holiness and to human sin.

(6) We are, therefore, to see in the death of Christ a revelation of God — the consummation of that disclosure of God which Christ came to make. And what of God's nature and feeling does the death of Christ disclose? It is, for one thing, Christ's supreme testimony to the deep concern of God for man. It also expresses what his whole experience reveals, the radical contrast of sin and holiness. The cross is the witness on the field of human history to the affront done by sin to the holy love of God. Sin nailed the Holy One of God to a cross of shame. How else is sin's nature and heinousness so clearly disclosed? But to this cross the Holy One of God willingly went for love of men. How else is God's nature so effectively revealed?

Its relation to the ethical nature of God.

(7) Christ's death, then, was a part of the realization of his saving purpose, and his saving purpose was grounded in the divine nature. His death must, therefore, be construed in the light of the idea of God which

he came to reveal and to render effective among men. The death of Christ can have no meaning which is incongruous with the Christian concept of God of which it is a revelation. It is a part of Christ's saving disclosure of God. It reveals at once the love of God which would stoop to suffer with and for man, and the holiness of God which makes its uncompromising protest against sin; and on this background of holy love it sets the dark enormity of sin, thereby exposing its true nature and expressing its ill desert. Thus in the death of Christ, regarded as a part of his mission on earth, we see the consummation of that revelation of God which he came to make. In it the total nature of God is revealed and therefore satisfied. In it the nature of sin is disclosed and therefore condemned. The display of holy love in the treatment of a sinful world is sin's most effective condemnation. God is satisfied only by revealing his perfections and by realizing the ends which are grounded in his holy love. In this sense we must see, in the saving work of Christ, culminating in his death, the highest satisfaction, because the consummate expression, of the total nature of God.

CHAPTER XIII

THE BELIEVING COMMUNITY [1]

Did Jesus propose to found a church?

DID Christ intend to establish a church, a visible outward society? Some reply that he manifested no such intention; others that the founding of a church was the chief end of all his life-work. We shall seek to ascertain, as nearly as possible, what data bearing upon this question are furnished in the Gospels.

Earlier and later meanings of "church."

The question just stated is likely to be somewhat misleading, and the discussion of it involved in confusion, in consequence of the different associations which the word "church" bears in the New Testament age and in our time. Dr. Hort very wisely begins his discussion of the Church in the New Testament by pointing out that the word "church" "carries with it associations derived from the institutions and doctrines of later times, and this cannot at present, without a constant mental effort, be made to convey the full and exact force which originally belonged to *ecclesia*" (the New Testament word which is rendered "church").[2] *Ecclesia* was the Greek translation of the Old Testament word for the assembly or congregation

The New Testament *Ecclesia*.

[1] General References: *The N. T. Theologies* of Weiss, I, Pt. I, ch. v, Beyschlag, I, Bk. I, ch. viii, and Stevens, Pt. I, ch. xi; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, II, 340–383; Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve* and *The Kingdom of God*, ch. xi; Horton, *Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 125–137; Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, Lects. I and II; Seeley, *Ecce Homo*, Pt. I; Gayford, article "Church," in Hastings' *B. D.*

[2] *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 1.

of Israel. Indeed, in the earlier English translations of the New Testament, the word was rendered "congregation" and not "church"; even in Matt. 16:18 we read in the Bishop's Bible: "Upon this rock I will build my congregation." Not until the appearance of King James's version in 1611 — our so-called "common" or "authorized" version — was the earlier rendering of *ecclesia* wholly supplanted by the word "church."[1] The mere matter of translation, however, is of minor importance. The main point is that *ecclesia* means rather an assembly, congregation, brotherhood, or community, than an outwardly organized society with officers and laws; it is a less institutional word than "church," as now employed. Hence, when it is asked: Did Christ found a church? it makes all possible difference whether "church" is used in the sense of the New Testament *ecclesia*, or with some of its modern connotations.

The two relevant passages.

The word "*ecclesia*" occurs but twice in the tradition of the Lord's words, both times in the first Gospel. The passages are as follows: "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear *thee* not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be established. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church:[2] and if he refuse to hear the church[2] also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican. Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."[3] "And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail

[1] See Hort, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[2] R. V., margin: congregation.

[3] Matt. 18:15–18.

against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." [1]

Found in Matthew only.

The fact that these striking sayings are found in Matthew alone is regarded by some as casting suspicion upon their genuineness. No positive evidence, however, has been adduced against them, and while we cannot explain their absence from the other Gospels, we have to remember that both the first and third evangelists used sources not available to the others. Luke has many striking sayings of Jesus which were unknown to Mark or Matthew. Let us inquire, then, what the passages, taken as they stand, imply respecting the *ecclesia* of Jesus.

Import of Matt. 18: 15–18.

The first passage which we have quoted relates to reconciliation among Christian brethren. The passage in Luke [2] which is parallel to Matt. 18: 15, 16 relates only to private reconciliation, and makes no reference to the mediation of the Church. It is, however, entirely natural to suppose that Jesus gave some such practical recommendation as that recorded in Matt. 18: 17. The simple rules of procedure in a case where one disciple has done another an injury and an alienation has ensued are three: In the first place, the offended party shall privately confer with the offender and seek to make him realize the nature of his fault (v. 15). If this effort fails, then let another conference be held in the presence of two or three other brethren who are competent to judge and to advise upon the merits of the case (v. 16). If now the guilty party still refuses to confess his fault, let the case be brought before the entire assembly of believers. If the company as a whole confirms the accusing judgment reached by the two or three wit-

The three rules given.

[1] Matt. 16: 18, 19. [2] 17: 3, 4.

nesses, and the offender still continues defiant, he shall then be regarded as self-excluded from the fellowship (v. 17). This verdict of the congregation, called "binding and loosing," shall be divinely ratified (v. 18). The congregation is intrusted with the right and the duty to uphold the law of its own being, and to purge itself of those who repudiate the principles on which its fellowship is founded.

Binding and loosing.

This passage clearly illustrates what is meant by binding and loosing. It was a technical Rabbinic term for forbidding and permitting.[1] The congregation must determine what was accordant with the principles of Christ and what was hostile to his spirit. This was the law of the brotherhood's self-preservation. Jesus gave no code of rules; he required his followers to learn and appreciate the nature and demands of the Christian life and to apply its spiritual laws. He required that his disciples should be aware of the genius of the Gospel, and should be able to test men and actions in accordance with it. Hence they were to prohibit or to allow according as the law of the spirit of life in Christ required. This right and duty the congregation of believers constantly exercised. They *bound*, that is, forbade, the circumcision of Gentile believers:[2] they *loosed*, that is, permitted, the ceremony of purification on the part of Paul and four other brethren, out of deference to the prejudices of the Jews.[3]

Peter, the rock-apostle.

These considerations throw light upon the words of Christ to Peter after his confession of his Messiahship.[4] The confession marked an epoch in the life-work of Jesus. It was an evidence of the divine

[1] This usage is fully illustrated in Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ*, II, 237–240 (Oxford ed.).

[2] Acts 15 : 28; Gal. 2 : 6.

[3] Acts 21 : 23–26.

[4] Matt. 16 : 17–19.

enlightenment by which the import of his life was beginning to be apprehended. It called forth the reply from Christ that upon this representative confessor he would build his "church," and that to him he would give the keys of the kingdom and the power of binding and loosing.[1] In Greek there is a play, in this passage, on the name of Peter, whose force is lost in translation. The name "Peter" means *rock*, and the words, "Thou art *Peter*, and upon this *rock*," are equivalent to saying: Peter, you have made good the meaning of your name;[2] you have proven yourself, by your confession, to be the rock-apostle, the corner-stone of the brotherhood. Upon Peter, then, as confessing Jesus' Messiahship and as voicing the conviction of all, Christ will build his congregation.

The power of the keys.

We have seen what is the meaning of binding and loosing. The phrase is here parallel to the term, "keys of the kingdom of heaven." The terms denote the functions of spiritual legislation and judgment, an illustration of which is the office committed to the congregation in Matt. 18:18: "Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." In this passage, it should be noted, the function which is ascribed to Peter in Matt. 16:19 is just as emphatically committed to the body of disciples as a whole. This fact accords with the circumstance that, in the passage under review, Peter is regarded not individually, but representatively. The strength of the brotherhood shall be in the spirit of devotion and enthusiasm expressed in Peter's representative confession.

The "primacy" of Peter.

The place of Peter in the early Christian community continued to be what it was on that notable day at Cæsarea Philippi, that of a *primus inter pares*. He

[1] Matt. 16:18, 19. [2] Cf. Jn. 1:42.

was the natural and acknowledged leader of the apostolic company. In all the lists of the apostles his name is first mentioned.[1] It was he who proclaimed the providential meaning of the events of Pentecost.[2] It was he to whom was accorded the privilege of opening "a door of faith unto the Gentiles."[3] These are illustrations of the "primacy" of Peter — the only primacy which was recognized in the apostolic age. It was a primacy of position and influence, such as is almost always accorded to some one person whenever a company of men organize or coöperate in a common work.

No official authority given to Peter.

The idea that upon Peter was bestowed any official primacy is wholly contrary to the facts recorded in the New Testament. We have seen that there is no power attributed to him which is not elsewhere committed to the whole believing community. Whatever the sitting upon thrones, referred to in Matt. 19 : 28, may mean, it was an honor which was promised to the other apostles as well as to Peter. Though Peter was one of the "pillars" of the primitive Church,[4] yet it appears to have been James, not Peter, who presided at the council at Jerusalem, and announced its decision.[5] On no occasion was Peter ever credited with any special authority. His fellow Jewish Christians freely criticised him when they thought him in the wrong,[6] and Paul had no hesitation in "resisting him to the face because he stood condemned" by his action at Antioch in withdrawing from the fellowship of the Gentile converts.[7]

The primitive Christian community

We have reviewed the only two passages in which Jesus is reported to have said anything of a "church,"

[1] Mk. 3 : 15 ; Matt. 10 : 2 ; Lk. 6 : 14 ; Acts 1 : 13.
[2] Acts 2.
[3] Acts 14 : 27.
[4] Gal. 2 : 9.
[5] Acts 15 : 19–21.
[6] Acts 11 : 2, 3.
[7] Gal. 2 : 11.

and we have seen that the word used to describe it (*ecclesia*) is a social rather than an institutional one. Did Christ, then, mean to found a "church"? Let us break up the question into several others, and briefly consider them in order. What is the relation between the *ecclesia* of disciples and the kingdom of God? Are there reasons for thinking that Jesus contemplated a society of disciples, a community held together by common ties and interests? Was the subsequent establishment of formally organized and officered "churches" in line with Christ's purpose, and a legitimate development from the primitive Christian brotherhood?

Church and kingdom.

If the terms "kingdom of God" and "*ecclesia*" had represented for Jesus essentially the same idea, it is difficult to explain why the former term should occur 112 times and the latter but twice in the Gospels. We must conclude that there is a difference between these terms, and that the kingdom represents the more characteristic conception of Jesus. That difference, however, is not easily defined. The kingdom represents so large and comprehensive a fact, while *ecclesia* appears so infrequently and so wholly without definition, that it is difficult to determine the exact relation of the two conceptions. Some general statements, however, may be made. The kingdom is the "invisible Church." The assembly of disciples can never adequately or accurately represent the kingdom. Some who form part of the *ecclesia* will prove inconstant and even counterfeit Christians, and will therefore form no part of the kingdom; there will be tares in the wheat. There will also be those who live under the law of the kingdom, but who, for one reason or another, are not associated with the visible *ecclesia*. The congregation can never more than partially represent the kingdom. While Jesus was on earth, there were sons of the kingdom outside the limits of Judaism who

could not, therefore, have formed any part of his *ecclesia* at the time, scattered children of God whom Jesus would yet gather together into one fellowship.[1] Ideally, no doubt, the *ecclesia* should represent the kingdom; but, in the nature of the case, it can never do so perfectly. The kingdom belongs to the realm of the spirit and the tests of membership in it are absolute: the *ecclesia* is the human society into which men who profess to acknowledge the law of the kingdom and the rule of the King unite themselves in order to give the truths of the kingdom visible concrete expression in human life and action. Now such expression of ideal truth will always be partial, because marked by human imperfection.

A brotherhood necessary.

That Jesus expected his followers to form a distinct society or brotherhood, with bonds of union peculiar to themselves, is probable from his method, quite apart from the twofold use of the word *ecclesia* which we have considered. He called twelve men into permanent association with himself, and commissioned them to preach and to heal in his name.[2] Though the duties of the apostles were not sharply defined, it is evident that Jesus regarded them as having a certain official relation to himself as his associates and messengers. The apostles were the chief human agents in teaching Christ's truth and in founding churches after the Master's departure; and such, we cannot doubt, they were intended to be. Here, then, we see the nucleus of an organization or congeries of organizations. The life of faith and love needed a visible form of manifestation. Provision must be made for common worship, fellowship, and work. The truth of the kingdom reigning in the hearts of men, will have its social expression, however inadequate such expression may

Grounds of this necessity.

[1] Jn. 10:16; 11:53.
[2] Mk. 3:13–19; 6:7–13; Lk. 6:12–16.

prove to be. Although the Gospels do not intimate that Jesus took any steps to organize his disciples into a formally constituted society, there is reason to believe that he contemplated this result as the consequence of the kingdom's nature and working. That the kingdom may most effectually leaven the life of the world, it must avail itself of the power which resides in the social instincts of men and in the common sympathies and increased activity which these social instincts foster. The kingdom of God is more than any church or all churches, but the kingdom needs and uses churches as means essential to the accomplishment of its ends.

The Christian and the Jewish church.

What was the relation of the kingdom of God, and of the outward organization which should promote it, to the Jewish national church? The answer is furnished by Jesus' principle of fulfilment. The Jewish theocracy was the provisional form in which the rule of God among men had been expressed and realized in Israel. The kingdom and the church which Jesus would found should be higher forms for the attainment of the same great ends on a far wider scale. The theocracy was local and national; it was identified with a certain form of civil and social organization. The commonwealth of Jesus was to be universal and spiritual. The call of a publican, Levi, or Matthew,[1] into the apostolate was an indication that neither national nor social distinctions were to condition membership in his society. His followers, on the contrary, were to be "the salt of the earth, the light of the world."[2] There is no note of exclusiveness or of limitation in all the teaching of Jesus concerning the kingdom and its manifestations.

Import of the "great commission."

With this conclusion agrees the language of the "great commission."[3] "All the nations" are within

[1] Mk. 2 : 14. [2] Matt. 5 : 13, 14. [3] Matt. 28 : 19, 20.

the scope of Jesus' purpose of salvation. Whatever objections may be made to the originality of this passage,[1] there can be no doubt that its note of universality accords with the spirit of Jesus' teaching as a whole. If the passage in some of its terms reflects the ecclesiastical usage of the later apostolic period, its substance accords perfectly with the genius of Jesus' teaching and work. The scope of his mission and kingdom was world-wide.

The perpetuity of the church.

History presents no greater marvel than the founding and perpetuity of the Christian Church. Think of a man living in a remote Roman province, wielding no sword, leading no popular uprising, exciting so little attention in the world that his name scarcely appears in the literature of his age, yet inaugurating a movement which has transformed the world. The history of the Church is not, indeed, adapted to excite in us unmixed approval and praise. Great evils, as well as great benefits, have attended it. But, apart from any estimate of the relative good and evil which are blended with its life, the persistence and prevalence of the Church do show what mighty movements in man's religious, moral, social, and political life owe their origin to the forces set in motion by the Man of Nazareth.

Its "inherent immortality."

The commonwealth of Christ, writes Professor Seeley, "has already long outlasted all the states which

[1] The principal objections are: (1) If Jesus had so charged his apostles, how could they have been so slow to adopt the idea of the gospel's universal destination? (2) Jesus elsewhere limits his mission to Israel (Matt. 9:5; 15:24). (3) The apostles actually baptized in the name of Jesus only (Acts 2:38: 8:16; 10:48; 19:5). They would not have done so if they had been taught to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Moreover, this trinitarian formula clearly suggests later ecclesiastical usage. I have considered these points in detail in my *Theology of the N. T.*, pp. 146–148.

were existing at the time of its foundation; it numbers far more citizens than any of the states which it has seen spring up near it. It subsists without the help of costly armaments; resting on no accidental aid or physical support, but on an inherent immortality, it defied the enmity of ancient civilization, the brutality of mediæval barbarism, and under the prevalent universal empire of public opinion it is so secure that even those parts of it seem indestructible which deserve to die. . . . The achievement of Christ in founding by his single will and power a structure so durable and so universal, is like no other achievement which history records. . . . The creative effort which produced that against which, it is said, the gates of hell shall not prevail, cannot be analyzed. No architect's designs were furnished for the New Jerusalem; no committee drew up rules for the Universal Commonwealth. . . . It must be enough to say, 'the Holy Ghost fell on those that believed.' No man saw the building of the New Jerusalem, the workmen crowded together, the unfinished walls and unpaved streets; no man heard the clink of trowel and pickaxe; it descended out of heaven from God."[1]

[1] *Ecce Homo* (8th ed.), pp. 305, 306, 309, 310.

CHAPTER XIV

THE SECOND COMING[1]

Christ's "coming" in connection with the tour of the twelve.

THE problems connected with the teaching of Jesus concerning his parousia, or second coming, are among the most difficult which the Gospels present. In order that the question to be considered may be presented as clearly as possible, it will be useful, first of all, to collate and compare the various references to the subject in the Synoptic Gospels. After the instructions which Jesus gave to the twelve when he sent them forth to teach and heal,[2] Matthew introduces an extended general discourse upon the dangers and duties of the disciples,[3] to which there is no parallel in the other Synoptics. In the midst of the passage occurs this saying: "But when they persecute you in this city, flee into the next: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come."[4]

[1] General References: Charles, *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, etc., and article "Eschatology," in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*; Salmond, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, Bk. III. and article "Eschatology," in Hastings' *B. D.*; W. A. Brown, article "Parousia," in Hastings' *B. D.*, and the literature there cited; Schwartzkopff, *The Prophecies of Jesus Christ*; H. Kingman, "The Apocalyptic Teaching of our Lord," in *The Biblical World*, March, 1897; Haupt, *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu u. s. w.*; Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, pp. 193-212; Beyschlag, *N. T. Theol.*, Bk. I. ch. viii; Stevens, *Theol. of N. T.*, Pt. I, ch. xii.

[2] Mk. 6:7-11; Matt. 10:1-15; Lk. 9:1-5.

[3] Matt. 10:16-42.

[4] Matt. 10:23.

Will occur within the lifetime of some who heard him

After Peter's confession, all the Synoptists record a prediction, by Jesus, of his death and resurrection.[1] He warns the disciples of the severe tests to which they will be subjected, and exhorts them to gain their lives by constancy and devotion in his service. Following this instruction there is a prediction of the coming of the Son of man to test the faithfulness of his disciples, to which is coupled a declaration that this event will occur within the lifetime of some of those who heard him speak. The parallel passages are as follows: —

For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds. Verily I say unto you, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.[2]	For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There be some here of them that stand *by*, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power.[3]	For whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in his own glory, and *the glory* of the Father, and of the holy angels. But I tell you of a truth, There be some of them that stand here, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God.[4]

Its relation to Jerusalem's overthrow.

In a long passage common, in substance, to all the Synoptists, Jesus predicts the overthrow of Jerusalem[5]. After the description of this catastrophe and its various attendant evils and sufferings, we find in all the Synoptics a prediction of the second coming. The relevant passages, in the three sources, are as follows: —

But immediately, after the tribulation of those days, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens	But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall be falling from heaven, and the powers that are in the heavens shall	And there shall be signs in sun and moon and stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, in perplexity for the roaring of the sea and the billows: men fainting for fear, and for expectation of the

[1] Mk. 8:31–9:1; Matt. 16:21–28; Lk. 9:22–27.
[2] Matt. 16:27, 28. [3] Mk. 8:38–9:1. [4] Lk. 9:26, 27.
[5] Mk. 13:1–23; Matt. 24:1–28; Lk. 21:1–24.

shall be shaken: and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send forth his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.[1]

be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in clouds with great power and glory. And then shall he send forth the angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven.[2]

things which are coming on the world: for the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. But when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh.[3]

The high priest shall witness his "coming."

The next relevant passage occurs in the description of Jesus' trial and is found in all three Synoptics. After the accusations of the multitude had been made against Jesus, the high priest demanded what answer he would make. When he answered nothing, the high priest put a second question to him, namely, whether he professed to be the Christ. This question called out the saying which is pertinent to our present inquiry. The question and its answer are presented, in the three accounts, as follows: —

And the high priest said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.[4]

Again the high priest asked him, and saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming with the clouds of heaven.[5]

And they led him away into their council, saying, If thou art the Christ, tell us. But he said unto them, If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask *you*, ye will not answer. But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God.[6]

Suddenness and nearness of the advent.

Other passages in which the coming of the Son of man is referred to are found in various connections. The suddenness of the event is compared to the descent of the flood in the days of Noah[7] and to the flashing of

[1] Matt. 24: 29–31. [3] Lk. 21: 25–28. [5] Mk. 14: 61, 62.
[2] Mk. 13: 24–27. [4] Matt. 26: 63, 64. [6] Lk. 22: 66–69.
[7] Matt. 24: 37–39; Lk. 17: 26.

Application of parables to the subject.

lightning across the sky.[1] The lesson of several of the parables is enforced by an appeal to the Messiah's coming to judgment. For example, the intervention of God on behalf of his people which is taught in the parable of the Unjust Judge, is conceived as taking place at Messiah's coming: "I say unto you, that he will avenge them speedily. Howbeit when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?"[2] Matthew appears to have regarded the parable of the Talents,[3] which pictures an absent lord as *returning* to his servants, as having reference to Messiah's return to judgment.[4] The parable is immediately followed by the picture of the judgment scene, which is introduced by the words: "But when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him," etc.[5] In Luke also, where the figure of a landlord's return home is employed, we find the same application of the idea to the parousia.[6] The duties of faithfulness and watchfulness are enforced by appeal to the liability of Messiah's coming, most unexpectedly, to judgment: "Be ye also ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh."[7]

Summary of the facts.

The principal facts, then, which the Synoptic Gospels present for our consideration are these: (1) According to Matthew, Jesus predicted his "coming" before the disciples had accomplished their tour among the cities of Israel.[8] (2) According to all the Synoptists, the coming of the Son of man in his glory, or in his kingdom, should take place while some of those to whom he spoke were still living.[9] (3) His

[1] Lk. 17:24. [2] Lk. 18:8. [3] Matt. 25:14–30.
[4] This application is less clearly made by Luke in the similar — and, originally, probably identical — parable of the Pounds (19:11–27). [5] Matt. 25:31. [6] Lk. 12:35–38.
[7] Lk. 12:40; Matt. 24:44. [8] Matt. 10:23.
[9] Matt. 16:27, 28; Mk. 8:38–9:1; Lk. 9:26, 27.

coming in clouds with power and glory was to follow the destruction of Jerusalem, according to Matthew, "immediately."[1] (4) The high priest was told that from the very time of speaking[2] he should see Christ coming with or on the clouds of heaven.[3] (5) In all cases where the idea of a lord in relation to his servants, especially of the lord's *return*, is found, it is applied by the Synoptists to the Messiah's parousia. The general result is, that Jesus is described as predicting his coming in the near future during his own generation,[4] or even more definitely, while his disciples were traversing Israel on their mission, directly after Jerusalem's downfall, or soon after his trial.

The general result.

The facts which we have reviewed give rise to such questions as these: (1) Can these representations be harmonized with one another? (2) Can the general teaching which is deduced from them be harmonized with the facts of history? (3) If not, are we to attribute the misconception respecting the time and accompaniments of the second advent to those who preserved the tradition of his words, including the Synoptists, or to Jesus himself?

Questions requiring answer.

The following opinions are possible, and common, with respect to the subject: —

Various solutions.

(1) Jesus expected his visible coming in his kingdom to occur soon. Being limited in knowledge, he was liable to such a mistake. He entertained the apocalyptic conception of the kingdom's sudden and supernatural establishment which was well-nigh universal in his age, and which held its ground in the

(1) Jesus did expect to come again soon.

[1] Matt. 24:30; Mk. 13:26; Lk. 21:27.

[2] Matthew's phrase is ἀπ' ἄρτι, "from this very time"; Luke's, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, "from now."

[3] Matt. 26:64; Mk. 14:62.

[4] "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished" (Matt. 24:34).

early Church throughout the apostolic period. The key-note of the whole New Testament is: "The Lord is at hand." The evangelists have correctly reported him as teaching that his glorious coming on the clouds, attended by hosts of angels, would occur speedily. This was the popular Jewish idea of Messiah's manifestation and victory, and the Gospels repeatedly assure us that Jesus also shared it.[1]

(2) His disciples misapprehended his references to his coming.

(2) The minds of the people in the time of Jesus were preoccupied with a certain conception of the Messiah's appearance. They thought that his coming would be attended by striking physical phenomena and by startling exhibitions of supernatural power. Now Jesus fulfilled none of these expectations, but when he spoke of great coming crises or triumphs of his kingdom, he was understood to be promising the fulfilment of the common apocalyptic hopes of the people. Hence he was, in a great measure, misunderstood, and this misunderstanding perpetuated itself in the tradition of his words and is reflected in the Synoptic Gospels. On this view it is held to be unlikely that Jesus foretold his personal visible return to earth within the generation then living, as the Synoptists represent him as doing. Sayings of his which originally had no such reference were, however, so understood, and all the prepossessions of the people of the time favored the development of this understanding of his words. This is attested by the widespread prevalence of the idea of a speedy apocalyptic coming of Christ in the apostolic age.[2]

(3) The coming spiritual or continuous.

(3) Many interpreters have sought an explanation of the facts by understanding the "coming" of Christ in a spiritual sense, or as a continuous process, or by

[1] So, *e.g.*, Keim, Weiss, Holtzmann, Wendt, Baldensperger, Charles, McGiffert.

[2] So, *e.g.*, Neander, Beyschlag, Fisher, Horton.

conceiving of various "comings" of Christ — events or crises in the progress of his kingdom The references to physical phenomena which should accompany his coming or comings are understood as pictorial or figurative. The Son of man did come in some event or experience which marked a step in the progress of his kingdom, while the disciples were canvassing the cities of Israel.[1] The Son of man coming in his kingdom is an expression for the coming of God's kingdom with power.[2] There were many of the people to whom he spoke who saw him come thus in his kingdom. He did come in a peculiar manner, it is said, in and directly after the destruction of Jerusalem. That event marked the downfall of the Jewish state and the cessation of the Jewish national worship. It opened the way to a great onward movement of the gospel. In connection with it Christ came in his kingdom. Especially did he come in triumph from that very hour of apparent defeat when he stood accused and condemned before the Jewish high priest. By his cross he conquered. When lifted up on the cross he drew men to him as never before. From this hour, when men condemned him to die, he came to the world in new power and glory, the glory of love and self-denying suffering.[3]

Unwarranted solutions or combinations.

Almost all efforts to solve the problem whose elements we have reviewed are forms of these three theories, or are built up by some combination of them. Some, indeed, try to combine quite incompatible elements in the theories just described. For example, some interpreters seek to show that while the coming of Christ is to be understood as an apocalyptic, eschatological event, it is not really affirmed that the event

[1] Matt. 10 : 23. [2] Cf. Matt. 16 : 28 and Mk. 9 : 1.

[3] This view, with variations, is found in Schliermacher, Hase, Bleek, and Meyer.

would happen during the lifetime of persons then living, or directly after Jerusalem's overthrow. This conclusion is justified by making "generation" mean "race": "This race (of mankind or of Christians), or nation (of Jews) shall not pass away, till all these things be accomplished,"[1] — and by transforming "immediately"[2] into "suddenly." These interpretations are mere makeshifts. They cut the knot, instead of untying it.

"The perspective of prophecy."

Some interpreters have sought to resolve the difficulty involved in Jesus' prediction of his coming in the near future by a theory of "the perspective of prophecy" — the idea that in prophetic pictures events near and distant are so massed together that the latter appear as if near.[3] Many recent scholars explain the incongruities in the great eschatological discourse by supposing that it is a composite of genuine sayings of Jesus with a Christian adaptation of a short Jewish apocalypse.[4]

A supposed Jewish apocalypse.

The alternative presented.

In view of the facts which have been adduced, we are confronted, in respect to this perplexing subject, with the following question and alternative: Did Jesus really predict that his second advent would occur within the generation then living? All the Synoptists repeatedly represent him as so doing. Assuming the correctness of their reports, the alter-

[1] Matt. 24:34. [2] Matt. 24:29. [3] So Bengel.

[4] According to Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, pp. 9–21, this apocalypse includes, in Mk. 13, vv. 7, 8, 14–20, 24–27, 30, 31. According to Professor Charles, *Critical History*, etc. (alternative title, *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian*), p. 329, the apocalypse includes, of Matthew's version (ch. xxiv), the following verses, 6–8, 15–22, 29–31, 34, 35. This theory of the structure of the eschatological discourse is held by Weiffenbach, Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, Bousset. I have summarized the argument for this division of the material in my *Theol. of the N. T.*, pp. 156, 157.

native is: Either he predicted in the most positive and definite terms what did not happen, or it must be shown that his "coming" (in glory, on the clouds, in his kingdom, etc.) can refer to some event which did happen, or to some process which began to be accomplished within the time specified in the prophecies.

Jesus did not predict his personal coming in the near future.

I cannot adopt the view that Jesus predicted his personal, visible coming to judgment as certain to occur in the near future, because (1) the supposition is derogatory to Jesus as the Son of God and Founder of the kingdom; (2) because such a prediction would be incongruous with his teaching concerning the nature and coming of his kingdom. His doctrine of the kingdom as a whole, as expressed in his parables, for example, does not accord with the idea of an apocalyptic coming in outward power and glory which the Synoptic tradition ascribes to Jesus. (3) So definite a prediction as that he would come, in the sense referred to, while the disciples were traversing the cities of Israel, or directly after Jerusalem's fall, is inconsistent with the express declaration that he did not know the time of his coming.[1] It is scarcely a fair reply to say that he declared that he would come within the next few years, though he did not know on what day or at what hour.

Do the Synoptists, then, mean something else by the "coming"?

Can we, then, adopt the view that the "coming" predicted was not the outward event which appears to be described, but was some crisis in the progress of Christ's kingdom which did occur while some of those who heard Jesus were still living? This supposition involves great exegetical difficulties, if we take the language of the Synoptics as it stands. The coming is to be "in the glory of the Father with the holy angels."[2] He will come "on the clouds with great

[1] Mk. 13:32; Matt. 24:36. [2] Mk. 8:38.

power and glory."[1] He will see, when he returns, whether he will find his professed disciples faithful to him.[2] It is very difficult to suppose that those who wrote down such descriptions of Christ's coming understood by them a spiritual event or process, or anything else than what the early Church believed in, a visible return of Christ to earth.[3] In my opinion this is what the language meant for those who preserved the tradition, including the Synoptists. If such language can have been meant in a spiritual sense, we may well despair of a scientific exegesis. In this view the great majority of scholars agree.

Did Jesus always mean the same thing by his "coming"?

On the other hand, it is a fair question whether Jesus himself could have meant the same thing by the various "comings" of which he is described as speaking. What appropriateness would there be in his declaring that his second advent to judgment would occur while the disciples were still absent on their mission of preaching and healing?[4] And how could that "coming" be the same as that which should directly follow Jerusalem's overthrow?[5] Again, in Luke, it is said that some of those present should "see the kingdom of God";[6] in Mark it is said that they should "see the kingdom of God *come with power*,"[7] while in Matthew the parallel phrase is, "till they see *the Son of man coming* in his kingdom."[8] It is not necessary to suppose that these expressions originally meant the same. The parallelism indeed suggests that the generic "coming of the kingdom" in Luke has become the specific "coming of the Son of man" in Matthew. We now discover that Matthew shows a special tendency to dwell on the visible coming

Special tendency in Matthew.

[1] Mk. 13:26. [2] Lk. 18:8.
[3] Cf. Acts 1:11; 1 Thess. 4:15, 16. [6] Lk. 9:27.
[4] Matt. 10:33. [7] Mk. 9:1.
[5] Matt. 24:29. [8] Matt. 16:28.

of the Son of man in glory, and to make the time of it perfectly definite. We have seen that he alone records the saying that Christ should come during the tour of the twelve.[1] He only makes Jesus say at Cæsarea Philippi that while some of his hearers were still living *he would come* in his kingdom.[2] It is Matthew only who makes Jesus state that he would come on the clouds *immediately* after Jerusalem's overthrow.[3] There is thus some evidence of a tendency on the part of the first evangelist to transform general statements, which might not have referred to a visible second coming, into a form which could have no other meaning. May not all the Synoptists have shared this tendency to some extent?

Other reasons for supposing various "comings"

There are other facts which look in the same direction. How could Jesus have meant that, from the very moment when he was speaking, the high priest should see him coming back to earth on the clouds of heaven? Yet that is what the words (in Matthew[4] and Mark[5]) now say. In Luke, however, we observe that they are much more general: "From henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God."[6] We can easily imagine the process by which such general expressions of Christ's triumph in his kingdom were transformed, under the power of the popular expectations of Messiah's glorious manifestation, into definite predictions of his outward advent. The fact that several of Jesus' parables whose matter and teaching do not favor such application, are made to refer to Christ's coming, illustrates the tendency in question.[7] Wherever the notion of the *return of a master* to his servants or possessions occurs, it is allegorized into a reference to the parousia.

[1] Matt. 10:23. [3] Matt. 24:29. [5] Mk. 14:62.
[2] Matt. 16:28. [4] Matt. 26:64. [6] Lk. 22:69.
[7] Lk. 12:35–48; 18:1–8; Matt. 25:14–29.

Conclusion: twofold conception of the kingdom and its coming.

The conclusion to which we are forced is that there are two widely different conceptions of the kingdom and its coming embodied in the Synoptic Gospels: (1) the conception of a spiritual kingdom, coming gradually, as leaven spreads in meal,[1] or as seed springs up and grows,[2] a kingdom whose coming is "without observation,"[3] and whose progress is to be a great historical world-process;[4] (2) the popular Jewish apocalyptic conception of a kingdom to be inaugurated suddenly with startling displays of divine power — the kingdom of the Danielic vision[5] in which the Son of man shall be manifested in splendor and power. We know that this was the current popular conception.[6] Was it also that of Jesus? How could he have held these two incompatible conceptions of the kingdom, to say nothing of the failure of the latter to be realized?

A choice of two views.

We must take our choice between these two views: (1) that Jesus was in error and held two incompatible views of his kingdom; and (2) that the current popular Messianic ideas have been blended, in our Synoptic accounts, with the tradition of Jesus' words, and have given to his sayings about his kingdom and its victory an outward and apocalyptic form which did not originally belong to them. This alternative is not the product of *a priori* considerations, but is forced upon us by the phenomena presented in the Gospels themselves. There is no escape from it except by resort to exegetical violence.

The verdict of criticism.

Exegesis can only find in the Synoptists a twofold doctrine of the kingdom and predictions of an apocalyptic coming of Christ which did not happen. It can

[1] Matt. 13:33
[2] Mk. 4:28.
[3] Lk. 17:20.
[4] Matt. 21:43.
[5] Dan. 7:13, 14.
[6] See, *e.g.*, Lk. 19:11; 24:21; Acts 1:6.

then merely offer a choice between attributing the error involved to Jesus, or to those who heard him and who had to do with the preservation of his words. Historical criticism alone brings any relief from this dilemma. This it does by showing, from the Gospels themselves, that there is a doctrine of the kingdom which is more accordant with the teaching of Jesus as a whole than is the apocalyptic doctrine; that the popular expectations would inevitably powerfully color and shape any prophecies which he might have spoken about his future success or the triumph of his cause, and that we can see the clearest traces of such a process of modification on the pages of the Synoptics themselves, especially in the case of Matthew.

A combination of two theories.

My conclusion, then, is a combination of the second and third general views sketched in the earlier part of this chapter,[1] namely: (1) Jesus actually spoke of various "comings" of his kingdom or of the Son of man in his kingdom — various "days of the Son of man"[2] — epochs in the progressive development of his kingdom; but (2) all these sayings were popularly understood, or came to be more and more understood, in an eschatological, apocalyptic sense as describing a visible personal return to earth on the clouds, and this conception of the subject was naturally embodied in our Synoptic tradition, although traces of the original meaning of Jesus are by no means wanting.

The conclusion tested.

Let us briefly apply these principles to the relevant passages. Though the terms in which the "coming" of Christ spoken of in the isolated passage, Matt. 10:23, and in the saying addressed to the high priest,[3] are substantially the same as those which elsewhere most explicitly describe Jesus' visible return to earth,[4]

[1] pp. 166, 167. [2] Lk. 17:22.
[3] Matt. 26:63, 64; Mk. 14:61, 62.
[4] *E.g.* Mk. 13:26.

yet their original intention cannot reasonably be so understood. How, for instance, could the high priest from that moment when Jesus addressed him witness Christ's visible advent, especially if, as another passage states, it was to occur after the destruction of Jerusalem. The "coming" there described must have been, not Christ's personal coming in clouds, but some coming of his kingdom (as Luke has it). The meaning probably is: From this very time when I stand before you condemned and apparently defeated, my triumph will begin. Through humiliation and death I will go to my glory and my crown. Even the great eschatological discourse, by connecting Christ's "coming" so definitely with Jerusalem's fall (especially in Matthew's version of it), suggests the question whether the original meaning of Jesus had not been that the downfall of the Jewish state and religious system would be followed by a signal forward movement of his cause. I have already referred to the apparently allegorical application of the parables about a *lord returning*. The modern study of the apocalyptic literature and ideas of Jesus' age has furnished us almost a demonstration of the fact that the people of his time could conceive of but one coming of the Messiah and that a glorious visible manifestation.[1] The Gospels, when read with historical insight, confirm this evidence, and furnish us hints and traces of another and higher view, namely, that of Jesus himself, underlying the popular beliefs and expectations by which his teaching had been overlaid.

Allegorizing of the parables.

This conclusion is strikingly confirmed by the fourth Gospel.[2] These various "comings" of Christ

Christ's coming in the fourth Gospel.

[1] See Charles, *Eschatology*, ch. ix.

[2] The evidence can only be summarized here. I have presented it in greater detail in my *Theol. of the N. T.*, Part II, ch. vii.

are recognized, but the subject is never presented in an apocalyptic manner. Indeed, the parousia of Christ, in the sense which it bears in the Synoptists and in Paul, occupies a very subordinate place in the Gospel of John. "If I will that he tarry till I come,"[1] is probably an allusion to it. The words, "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will receive you unto myself,"[2] are understood by many in an eschatological sense. But it is by no means certain that the practical religious use which is commonly made of this passage, which regards it as referring to Christ's coming at death to believers, is not nearer to its original import. In most instances Christ's "coming," according to the fourth Gospel, is, clearly spiritual, for example: "I will not leave you desolate: I come to you;"[3] "I go away, and I come again to you."[4] The context makes it quite clear that this coming is his coming in the gift of the Spirit. In like manner that future sight of Jesus which the disciples are to experience[5] appears to be a spiritual seeing.

Combination of the Synoptic and Johannine representations.

We may, therefore, say, in general, that the place which in the Synoptics is occupied by the great eschatological discourse, is taken, in the fourth Gospel, by the prophecies concerning Christ's coming to his disciples in the Spirit. If we are to regard the Johannine presentation of the teaching of Jesus as even approximately adequate, we must admit that the almost entire absence from it of apocalyptic elements and the application of the notion of Christ's "coming" to spiritual events, furnishes good reason for thinking that Jesus could not have conceived of the coming and triumph of his kingdom after the manner of popular Jewish expectation. I find strong confirmation of this con-

[1] Jn. 21:22. [2] Jn. 14:3. [3] Jn. 14:18. [4] Jn. 16:7. [5] Jn. 16:16, 22.

clusion in the general view of the kingdom which is presented, apart from references to the "coming," in the Synoptics themselves. I therefore conclude that the representation that Jesus would return to earth on the clouds of heaven during the generation then living, was due to misapprehension and confusion on the part of the disciples.[1]

[1] The same conclusion is reached by Dr. Horton. "Tradition," he says, "has not accurately recorded Jesus' specific forecasts of the final judgment. There was an initial confusion between certain things he had said concerning the downfall of the temple of Jerusalem, and certain descriptions he had given of the Last Day, and the return of the Son of man as the Judge of mankind." — *Teaching of Jesus*, p. 143. Cf. S. Davidson, *Introduction*, I, 402, 403.

CHAPTER XV

THE RESURRECTION AND JUDGMENT[1]

Synoptic teaching concerning resurrection.

LITTLE is explicitly said in the Synoptic teaching of Jesus concerning the resurrection. There is but one passage in which the subject is specially considered.[2] The Sadducees denied the doctrine of resurrection, and, with a view to exhibiting the absurdity of it, put to Jesus this question: If a woman should be successively married to seven brothers, to which of the seven would she belong in the resurrection? In reply Jesus pointed out two mistaken assumptions which were contained in their argument: (1) the error of supposing that, in the spirit world, such relations as those of marriage were maintained; and (2) their failure to recognize the power of God to provide for men a mode of life suited to the condition of the world beyond. He then positively refuted their supposed *reductio ad absurdum* by reference to their own sacred Scriptures, the Pentateuch, reminding them that God is there described as the God of the patriarchs, whose existence is thereby assumed. "He is not the God of the dead, but of the living,"[3] said

[1] General References: In addition to the literature cited at the beginning of the last chapter, see Salmond, *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, Bk. III, chs. iii and iv; Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*, Lect. IX; Cone, *The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations*, 118–137; Stalker, *The Christology of Jesus*, ch. vii; Gilbert, *The Revelation of Jesus*, ch. vii.

[2] Matt. 22:23–33; Mk. 12:18–27; Lk. 20:27–40.

[3] Mk. 12:27.

P. S. LIBRARY K C K. BAPTIST SEMINARY

Jesus; your Scriptures assume that the patriarchs still live; you neither understand these Scriptures, nor know the power of God.

Implications of this teaching.

This teaching involves the unequivocal assertion of a future life, but makes no explanation concerning the mode or condition of it. 1. There shall be a blessed life for those who are "accounted worthy to attain to that world, and the resurrection from the dead," being "sons of God, sons of the resurrection." [1] 2. In that life the good deeds of men shall be recompensed.[2] But these general expressions leave many questions unanswered. Under what forms of thought Jesus clothed his idea of resurrection we do not know. It is to be observed, however, that he predicates resurrection of persons, rather than of bodies, and that resurrection is said to be "from among the dead." [3] These expressions suggest the idea that the person *rises* from the realm or state of death into a realm or state of life and happiness. The form of the thought seems to be determined by the current idea of Sheol as the abode of the dead, from which the person ascends into a sphere of blessedness. The allusions of Jesus to the subject accord with these current Jewish conceptions. It is noticeable, however, that he never dwells upon the incidents of this common view as if they were in any way essential to his own thought, but lays stress only upon the generic truth that the forces of life will triumph over death, that man is destined to live beyond the grave, that he will not sink in oblivion and nothingness, but rise to renew and perpetuate the life which God gave him here on earth.

Relation to Jewish thought.

Are all men to be raised?

It is a disputed point whether Jesus considered all men, or only the just, to be subjects of the resurrec-

[1] Lk. 20:35, 36. [2] Lk. 14:14.

[3] ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν.

tion. It was a mooted question in Jewish theology.[1] All answers to the question must be inferential. Certainly resurrection could not have the same meaning for good and for evil men. Hence the "worthy" were distinguished as "sons of the resurrection."[2] And yet, he speaks of the resurrection of "the dead"[3] in general, and of "the resurrection of the just,"[4] — a phrase which may fairly be held to imply a resurrection, also, of the unjust. This inference is explicitly affirmed in the Johannine tradition.[5] If the generic idea of resurrection is the survival of death, or, in Jewish phraseology, escape from Sheol, it does not appear, from the principles of Jesus, why it should not hold true of all men, although the accompaniments and conditions of resurrection would necessarily differ. So far as we can judge, however, Jesus used the idea of resurrection, as did Paul, almost wholly as a means of encouragement and of comfort; that is, he set it in relation to the hope of man for a blessed life in the world beyond.

Johannine conception of resurrection.

In the Johannine tradition of the Lord's words the resurrection is viewed comprehensively as the triumph of life over death. It is contemplated, now as a present, now as a future, fact. Resurrection is a part of the gift of eternal life, and eternal life is a present possession of the believer. "He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life. Verily, verily I say unto you, The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live."[6] We may either regard this present resurrection as an ethical quickening, the rising with Christ into newness of life which Paul describes, or as so securely guaranteed to the believer

[1] See Charles, *Eschatology*, 302 *sq.*, for summary.
[2] Lk. 20:36. [4] Lk. 14:14. [6] Jn. 5:24, 25.
[3] Mk. 12:26. [5] Jn. 5:29.

that it may be spoken of, by anticipation, as already his. Perhaps these two ideas may be combined. The believer has already entered on the eternal life, and already experiences the operation of its laws and processes. This life completely transcends the relations of time. He is already victor over death, and whatever experiences or changes may await him, either here or hereafter, will only be a part of the process of his triumph over death and all hindering evils. He belongs to life, and in the power of that divine life he conquers.

The "day" of resurrection and judgment in John.

The eschatological language concerning a future "day" of resurrection and judgment is also found in the fourth Gospel. "I will raise him up at the last day;"[1] "for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill, unto the resurrection of judgment."[2] But this language does not exclude the more comprehensive conception of resurrection as a present fact, and hence as a great process in which the possessor of eternal life progressively partakes. "I know," said Martha, "that he [Lazarus] shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day."[3] Jesus' reply was: "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die."[4] Jesus is the giver of life, here and now — the power of a present resurrection; the believer already triumphs over death; even in death he lives; yes, for him there is no death. That there is such a thing as a future resurrection — some crisis of deliverance or epoch of victory, Jesus does not question. But his teaching takes a wider sweep, and sets forth

[1] Jn. 6:39, 40, 44, 54.
[2] Jn. 5:28, 29.
[3] Jn. 11:24.
[4] Jn. 11:25, 26.

the more inclusive truth that this resurrection is a victory of life that may already begin here.

Jesus' doctrine predominantly ethical.

It will be noticed how predominantly ethical or qualitative is Jesus' doctrine of life and of death. With him the questions concerning the future are not questions about times and places. He lays no stress, as did Paul, upon the mere corporeal aspect of resurrection. He says nothing of a resurrection of the body though we may well suppose that the idea included for him the clothing of the soul in a suitable embodiment. The point to be noticed is that his conception of resurrection was comprehensive. It was victory over death, with whatever incidents and experiences that might involve. Hence we see why he speaks almost exclusively of the resurrection of "the just," or of those who have received the eternal life. He contemplates resurrection as a part of God's gracious bestowment of life; he grounds it in him who lives and who is the Source and Giver of life. That those who refuse the life vanish at death, experiencing nothing that may be called resurrection, Jesus does not say. They, too, are contemplated as surviving death, but what are the nature and accompaniments of that "resurrection of judgment" which they experience we are not told. The veil is drawn and their fate is hidden.

The "day of judgment" following the advent.

The idea of a future "day of judgment" was a current Jewish conception. It was popularly associated with Messiah's coming, when he would condemn and punish Israel's enemies. The Synoptists, especially Matthew, attribute to Jesus the idea of a future judgment day, following his own second advent. This conception was universal in the apostolic age. The relevant passages are closely connected with the sayings about the parousia which we examined in the last chapter, and many of the difficulties there found

also apply to them. Matthew connects a number of sayings of Jesus with "the day of judgment," of which no such application is made in the parallel passages.[1] In Matthew we even read that "every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment."[2]

The parable of judgment.

It is also the first Gospel alone which has presented to us, in connection with the parousia discourse, a parable of the judgment in which all the nations are described as appearing before the Son of man, who sits upon his glorious throne, and separates them as a shepherd divides the sheep from the goats.[3] Interpreters are much divided respecting the intention of this passage.

Three interpretations: (1) judgment of Christians only.

Three general views are current: (1) Some[4] hold that this parable is a picture of the judgment of professing Christians only, by which the counterfeit are distinguished from the genuine by the tests of love and service. The accepted are called "blessed of my Father," "righteous," and "my brethren," for whom the kingdom had been prepared from the foundation of the world,[5] terms which can naturally designate only believers, while the rejected are described as calling Jesus "Lord" and as claiming to be among his disciples.[6]

(2) of heathen.

(2) Others[7] maintain that the description relates specifically to the judgment of the heathen, some[8] holding that it is the judgment of such heathen as have come into contact with Christian believers ("my brethren"), and others,[9] that all heathen are comprehended because Christ's "brethren" are not limited

[1] Cf. Matt. 7:21–23 with Lk. 13:25–27; Matt. 12:33–37 with Lk. 6:43–45. [2] Matt. 5:22. [3] Matt. 25:31–46.
[4] *E.g.* Meyer and Weiss. [6] Verse 44.
[5] Verses 34, 37, 40. [7] *E.g.* Bruce, Wendt, and Forrest.
[8] So Wendt. [9] So Bruce.

to believers, but include all men. This general view is thought to be favored by the phrase, all the "nations," which is taken in its very frequent meaning, the Gentiles. It is further pointed out that those to whom Christ is known are judged by their acceptance or denial of him,[1] while, elsewhere, heathen are represented as approved or condemned according to their treatment of his disciples.[2] Especially striking is the parallel in Matt. 10: 42: "And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward."

(3) of all men.

(3) The more common view is that the passage describes the judgment of all mankind.[3] Indeed, most scholars[4] who give it a more limited application admit that, in its present form, it is intended to describe a universal judgment. Their theories relate to its original intention, which they seek to discover behind its present aspect of universality. The connection of the parable with the parousia and the natural force of the phrase, "all the nations," certainly favor the conception of a universal judgment. On the other hand, it is difficult to harmonize with Jesus' teaching as a whole the idea that the eternal destiny of men is determined by works of charity alone.

Arguments for and against each view.

Each one of the three views, when strictly applied, encounters considerable difficulties. If professing Christians only were in view, why should those who are judged be distinguished from the "brethren" of Jesus, and why should they be represented as unaware of the nature and object of their good deeds? If, on

[1] Matt. 10: 32, 33.
[2] Matt. 10: 40–42; Lk. 10: 12–16.
[3] So, *e.g.*, Morison and Broadus.
[4] So Weiss, Wendt, and Beyschlag.

the other hand, non-Christians alone were thought of, it is difficult to see why this class should not have been more plainly indicated. In view of all the considerations affecting the question, I am inclined to think that we cannot fairly derive more from the passage than a principle of judgment. It is a pictorial description of man's relation to his deeds, illustrating, especially, how small acts of kindness and mercy may be an index of the deepest principles and motives which rule the life. The description of the deeds done need not be regarded as presenting the only test and measure which will be applied to men and their conduct. It is not improbable that the parable originally referred to some specific relations or situation, like the saying in Matt. 10 : 42, of which it may be regarded as an expansion. We can only say that, as it stands, it was conceived as a description of a general assize, but that it describes the application of only one of those tests by which Christ was wont to determine the characters of men.

Judgment in the fourth Gospel.

We have seen that in the Johannine tradition both the coming of Christ and the resurrection are more comprehensively viewed than in the Synoptic reports of Jesus' words. There are other "comings" of Christ besides that at the end of the age; the resurrection is involved in the present bestowment and possession of eternal life. There is something analogous to these examples in the Johannine representation of judgment. The judgment of men is proceeding here and now: "Now is the judgment of this world;"[1] "As I hear, I judge: and my judgment is righteous;"[2] "Yea and if I judge, my judgment is true;"[3] "For judgment came I into this world."[4] This conception of a present judgment, wrought by the power of the

Judgment a present fact.

[1] Jn. 12 : 31.
[2] Jn. 5 : 30.
[3] Jn. 8 : 16.
[4] Jn. 9 : 39.

truth to compel decision, is thus summarized by the author of the Gospel, "And this is the judgment, that the light is come into this world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil."[1] A process of judgment, then, is inseparable from the work of salvation. The light necessarily judges because it reveals. In this sense, though Christ came not to judge but to save the world,[2] judgment was unavoidably involved in his work. He must divide men into those who accept and those who refuse the light of his saving truth.

Present and future judgments not irreconcilable.

This thought of a continuous, present judgment does not exclude the conception of a future, final judgment. If the judgment of this world is now taking place,[3] there is also to be a judgment "in the last day."[4] The continuous testing by which the destinies of men are being determined terminates in a crisis — in a future judgment, which is the goal of the process of judgment which is going forward constantly in the life of every man.

Discrepancies to be resolved.

It is only by means of a comprehensive idea of judgment that we are able to resolve the seeming contradictions between the statements: Jesus did not come to judge, and for judgment did he come into the world; judgment is present, and it is reserved for a future "day." There is yet one other discrepancy to be resolved. We are told that all judgment has been committed to the Son,[5] but, elsewhere, that it is not he, but his truth, that judges men: "If any man hear my sayings and keep them not, I judge him not, the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day."[6] It is his truth that judges men; that is, the attitude of men toward his truth — the absolute standard of goodness — necessarily involves their

[1] Jn. 3:19.
[2] Jn. 3:17; 12:47.
[3] Jn. 12:31.
[4] Jn. 12:48.
[5] Jn. 5:22.
[6] Jn. 12:47, 48.

judgment. Christ's purpose is to save, but he can save only by winning men to the life of holy love. The demands of this life impose tests upon men, and their acceptance or rejection of those demands places them either on the right hand or the left.

The issues of judgment.

The judgment shall issue in a just recompense of reward or penalty according to men's deeds.[1] Destiny shall be the fruitage of the life. More than this general principle we may not deduce from the relevant passages without unwarrantably applying to their figurative language the categories of time and of place. The Gehenna which is set over against the life of love and self-denial is a symbol of the consequences of refusing to serve and suffer for one's own and others' good.[2] Neither the context nor the parallels in Matthew[3] favor the idea that the figures of the fire and the worm are meant to describe final destiny. Nor can the doctrine of endless punishment and of the necessary fixity of destiny at death be legitimately built upon the word "eternal," both because it is itself too indefinite a word, and because it is but the Greek translation of a still more indefinite Aramaic term. Both the rewards and the penalties of the world to come are eonian (eternal); they are those which belong to the great coming eon, the epoch toward which the longings of all hearts were directed, the age of Messiah's coming, victory, and judgment.

The victory of life over death.

The life, then, which is begun here is to continue, since God is the God of the living; the life of man is not "rounded with a sleep," but persists and shall conquer death, and in the world to come shall reap its appropriate fruitage. These are the principles in which is rooted Jesus' teaching concerning the resurrection and the judgment.

[1] Matt. 16:27. [2] Mk. 9:47, 48. [3] Matt. 5:29, 30.

INDEX

Abbott, E. A., 19
Adamson, T., 95
Alexander, G., 47, 81
Apocalypse, a supposed Jewish, 168
Apocalyptic use of "Son of man," 90
Appel, 81
"Aramaic theory" of "Son of man," 88 *sq.*
Asceticism, 123

Bacon, B. W., 19, 31
Baldensperger, W., 1, 60, 81, 89, 160, 161
Barnasha, 88 *sq.*
Bartlet, J. V., 81
Baur, F. C., 87
Beyschlag, W., 47, 89, 117, 130, 140, 150, 161, 166, 183
Binding and loosing, 153
Bleek, F., 167
Blood, "shed for many," 144
Bousset, W., 1, 49, 59, 65, 67, 168
Briggs, C. A., 38
Broadus, J. A., 183
Brooks, P., 183
Brown, W. A., 161
Bruce, A. B., 31, 47, 53, 65, 68, 95, 106, 130, 140, 150

Candlish, R. S. 58, 70
Ceremonial law, Jesus' attitude toward, 53
Charity, 137
Charles, R. H., 59, 81, 84, 89, 96, 161, 166, 168, 174, 179
Cheyne, T. K., 38
Children, Jesus' treatment of, 114, 115
Christology, beginnings of, 103
Church, the, Jesus' teaching concerning, 150 *sq.*; the Jewish, 158; perpetuity of, 159, 160
Civil government, 124
Coming, the second, 161 *sq.*; to occur soon, 162; theories concerning, 165 *sq.*; twofold conception of, 172; in the fourth Gospel, 174, 175
Commission, the great, 158
Community, the believing, 150 *sq.*
Cone, O., 19, 92, 140, 177
Congregation, the, 150 *sq.*
Crawford, T. J., 70
Criticism, verdict of, on the "second coming," 172

Davidson, S., 176
Day of resurrection, 180
Dalman, G., 58, 84, 88, 95, 96, 97, 100, 102
Death, of Jesus, saving significance of, 142 *sq.*; of Jesus, theories concerning, 145 *sq.*; according to the fourth Gospel, 146; its relation to his life, 148; to the nature of God, 148, 149
Denney, J., 58
Depravity, total, not taught by Jesus, 113
Divorce, 121
Driver, S. R., 38, 81

Drummond, J., 81, 84
Drummond, R. J., 69

Ecclesia, 150 *sq.*
Eerdmans, 88
Enoch, Book of, 90, 96
Esdras, 2, 90, 96
Estes, D. F., 47

Fairbairn, A. M., 1
Family, 121
Farrar, F. W., 35
Fasting, Jesus' estimate of, 50
Fatherhood of God, in Jesus' teaching, 70 *sq.*; its scope, 72, 73
Fisher, G. P., 166
Forgiveness, 134, 135
Forrest, D. W., 177

Gayford, S. C., 150
Gilbert, G. H., 177
God, as Israel's Father only, 3; transcendence of, in Judaism, 4; fatherhood of, 70 *sq.*
Goodspeed, G. S., 1
Good works, atoning value of, in Jewish theology, 15
Gospel, the fourth, peculiarities of, 29, 32; on the fatherhood of God, 73 *sq.*; on the "coming" of Christ, 174, 175; doctrine of resurrection in, 179; of judgment, 184, 185
Gospels, the, 19 *sq.*; motives to their composition, 21, 22; patristic testimony concerning, 22–24; two-source theory of, 25; dates of, 28; historicity of, 28
Gould, E. P., 47
Grace, 139
Gunkel, H., 88

Hall, F. J., 118
Harnack, A., 29, 36, 58, 70, 92, 95, 104, 106, 117
Hase, K., 167
Haupt, E., 161
Hausrath, A., 1
Holtzmann, H. J., 19, 47, 67, 89, 160, 168
Holy Spirit, the sin against, 114
Hort, F. J. A., 67, 142, 150
Horton, R. F., 58, 68, 130, 140, 150, 166, 176
Hovey, A., 118

Irenæus, 22, 23
Issel, E., 58, 65, 67

Jacob, L., 47
Jerusalem, overthrow of, 162
Jesus, his teaching contrasted with Judaism, 5; his conception of the Messiah's calling, 12, 13; fulfils the Old Testament concept of, 14; his oral method of teaching, 19, 20; his method in general, 33 *sq.*; contrasted with that of the scribes, 34; its outward forms, 37 *sq.*; his teaching concerning the Old Testament, 47 *sq.*; as the revealer of God, 79 *sq.*; his self-testimony, 85 *sq.*; his estimate of man, 106 *sq.*; his view of nature, 118 *sq.*; of social life, 120; teaching concerning righteousness and love, 130 *sq.*; concerning salvation, 140 *sq.*; his references to the Church, 150 *sq.*; on his "second coming," 161 *sq.*; on resurrection and judgment, 177 *sq.*
Jewish religious beliefs in Jesus' age, 1 *sq.*; history and literature, references to, in the teaching of Jesus, 125 *sq.*
Jonah-sign, 125
Judgment, doctrine of, 182–184; in the fourth Gospel, 184, 185; issues of, 186
Jülicher, A., 19, 28, 33

Kaftan, J., 65
Kant, 130

Keim, T., 166
Keys, the power of, 154
Kidd, J., 58, 69
Kingdom of God, as conceived in Judaism, 7, 9; Jesus' teaching concerning, 58 *sq.*; in the Old Testament, 59; in popular Jewish thought, 60; its various aspects, 64 *sq.*; definitions of, 67 *sq.*; and the Church, 156
Kingman, H., 161
Knowledge, Jesus', problem of, 117
Krop, E., 58, 89

Law, Jesus' fulfilment of, 54 *sq.*
Legal tendency, in Judaism, 2, 48
Legalism, 139
Lietzmann, H., 81, 88
Life, the future, in Jesus' teaching, 115, 116
Lightfoot, J., 121, 153
Logia, The, 24
Love, 132 *sq.*; 138, 139
Luke, Gospel of, 27
Lütgert, W., 58, 67

McGiffert, A. C., 166
Mackintosh, R., 47, 56
Man, Jesus' estimate of, 106 *sq.*
Mark, patristic testimony concerning, 22; relation to Luke, 23; characteristics of, 26
Martineau, J., 88
Mathews, S., 1, 2, 7, 33, 35, 58, 65, 68, 100
Matthew, early tradition concerning, 23; characteristics of, 26; representations of second coming, 170
Mead, C. M., 70
Messiah, Jewish doctrine of, 10, popular view of, reflected in the New Testament, 12
Messianic hope, in Israel, 6 *sq.*; Messianic meaning of "Son of man," 90 *sq.*
Meyer, 65, 167
Montefiore, 5
Moorhouse, J., 117
Morison, J., 183

Nature, Jesus' references to, 117 *sq.*
Neander, A., 87, 166
Nösgen, K. F., 88

Old Testament, Jesus' teaching concerning, 47 *sq.*
Orr, J., 65, 69

Papias, 22
Parables, Jesus' use of, 39 *sq.*; distinguished from the fable, myth, proverb, and allegory, 40–42; interpretation of, 42–45; applied to second coming, 174; of judgment, 182
Parousia, see Coming, second.
Pascal, 105
Patience, 136
Paulus, 88
Peabody, F. G., 65, 106, 117
Pericope adulteræ, 111 *sq.*
Peter, the rock-apostle, 153; primacy of, 154
Possession, demoniacal, 127 *sq.*
Property, private, 122
Prophecy, "perspective of," 168
Prophetic tendency, in Judaism, 3, 48

Ransom, 145
Religion, the, of a good life, 134 *sq.*
Resurrection, doctrine of, 177 *sq.*; in Jewish thought, 178; universal or limited, 178; in fourth Gospel, 179
Reuss, E., 87
Righteousness, Jewish doctrine of, 16; in Jesus' teaching, 130 *sq.*

Ritschl, A., 65, 67

Sabbath, the, in Jesus' teaching, 53
Sacrifice, Jesus' teaching concerning, 51; law of, 143
Sadducees, their denial of the future life, 115
Salmon, G., 19
Salmond, S. D. F., 161, 177
Salvation, late Jewish doctrine of, 14, 15, 17; Jesus' doctrine of, 140 *sq.*
Sanday, W., 19, 33, 58, 65, 66, 70
Schliermacher, 167
Schmidt, N., 81, 88
Schmiedel, P. W., 19
Schmoller, O., 58, 65, 67
Schultz, H., 77
Schürer, E., 1, 2, 7, 38, 49, 58, 84
Schwartzkopff, P., 161
Seeley, J. R., 58, 111, 130, 150, 159
Service, law of, 144
Sin, Jesus' doctrine of, 137 *sq.*; against the Holy Spirit, 114
Sinners, in the popular judgment and in that of Jesus, 109
Social life, Jesus' view of, 120
Son of God, its meaning in the Old Testament, 95, 96; in the apocalyptic books, 96; use of, in the Synoptics, 97 *sq.*; New Testament use of, distinguished from that of speculative theology, 102
Son of man, use of, in the Gospels, 81; in the Old Testament, 82; apparent threefold meaning of, 85, 86; in the fourth Gospel, 86; theories concerning, 87 *sq.*
Sonship, of men, to God, 75 *sq.*
Spirit-world, Jesus' references to, 127
Stalker, J., 81, 88, 89, 95, 140, 177
Stanton, V. H., 7, 59, 84, 87
Stapfer, E., 35, 51, 53
Strauss, D. F., 88

Teaching, of Jesus, methods of, 33 *sq.*; saving significance of, 141. See special topics
Thayer, J. H., 33
Titius, A., 58
Toy, C. H., 1, 118
Trench, R. C., 33, 42

Uloth, 88

Virtues, the passive, 136

Weber, F., 1, 7
Weiffenbach, E. W., 168
Weiss, B., 39, 47, 53, 89, 135, 150, 166, 183
Weiss, J., 58, 65, 67, 89
Weizsäcker, K., 168
Wellhausen, J., 81, 88
Wendt, H. H., 1, 19, 33, 35, 48, 58, 65, 68, 88, 95, 106, 117, 127, 135, 140, 150, 166, 168, 183
Wernle, P., 19
Westminster catechism, 115
Woods, F. H., 19
Words, moral significance of, 108
Worship, 137
Wright, A., 19

Zahn, T., 28

Printed in the United States of America.

S. T. -
B. T. -
Hist. -
P. R.
P. C. -
C. T.

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

SEP 30 1963
NOV 4 1986

CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
0 0021 0017242 4

232.954
S844

Stevens, George Barker
AUTHOR

The teaching of Jesus.
TITLE

10157

Date Due | Borrower's Name

232.954
S844 Stevens, George Barker
The teaching of Jesus.

10157